DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 258	IR 004 035
TITLE	Changing Objectives in Research Libraries. Minutes of the Semi-Annual Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (83rd, Chicago, Illinois, January 19, 1974).
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISSN-0044-9652
PUB DATE	19 Jan 74
NOTE	183p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; Data Bases; *Library Administration; Library Associations; *Library Automation; On Line Systems; *Research Libraries; Serials; Technology; University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	ARL; *Association of Research Libraries

ABSTRACT

The January, 1974, meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) focused on "Changing Objectives in Research Libraries." Two speakers--Hugh Atkinson, Director of Libraries at the Ohio State University, and Richard Boxx, Director of Libraries at the University of Tennessee--discussed client definitions of library objectives, changes in management styles, structuring for choice, planning techniques, shifting resources, and non-print media. Herman Fussler of the University of Chicago then reported on his project with the Alfred Sloan Foundation to investigate the current status and potentials of technology in libraries. Lawrence Livingston reported on an interlibrary effort to build an on-line national serials data base. Duscussion and reports from APL commissions and executives followed. (KB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129258

US ISSN 0044-9652

Changing Objectives In Research Libraries

Minutes of the
Eighty-Third
Meeting

January 19, 1974
Chicago, Illinois

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR 004035

CONTENTS

Page

Opening 1

CHANGING OBJECTIVES IN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Introduction--Page Ackerman 2

Speakers:

Hugh Atkinson
Richard Boss

Discussion:
Ben Bowman
Richard Chapin
Arthur Hamlin

RESEARCH LIBRARIES AND TECHNOLOGY: SOME FORCES FOR CHANGE; Based on a Report to The Sloan Foundation

Presentation--Herman Fussler 13

Discussion:

Frederick Wagman 25
Richard De Gennaro 29

A COMPOSITE EFFORT TO BUILD AN ON-LINE NATIONAL SERIALS DATA BASE
Lawrence Livingston 33

BUSINESS MEETING

Election of Board Members 38
Report of Membership Committee 40
Report of the Committee on Machine-Based Serials Records 48
Report of Interlibrary Loan Studies 50
National Commission on Libraries & Information Science 53
Changes in Role of Commission and Committees 57
Reports of Commission Chairmen
  Development of Resources 60
  Organization of Resources 61
  Access to Resources 63
  Management of Research Libraries 64
  External Affairs 67
Executive Director's Report 70
President's Report 72

APPENDICES

Page

A. Report of the Membership Committee....75
B. Report of the Committee on Data Bases....79
C. Report of the Committee on Machine-Based Serials Records....81
D. Statement on Mission and Objectives....84
E. ARL Organizational Structure....87
F. Report of the Commission on Development of Resources....89
G. Report of the Commission on Organization of Resources....93
H. Report of the Commission on Access to Resources....98
I. Report of the Commission on Management of Resources....102
J. Report of the Commission on External Affairs....107
K. Auditor's Report....109
L. Center for Chinese Research Materials Report....123
M. Office of University Library Management Studies Report....128
N. Report of the National Agricultural Library....138
O. Report of the National Library of Medicine....147
P. Report of the Library of Congress....148
Q. Attendance at 83rd Meeting....168
R. Commissions and Committees of ARL....172
S. Membership of the ARL....173

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 83rd Meeting

William S. Budington, presiding

The Eighty-Third Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, Illinois on January 19, 1974.

President William S. Budington opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing representatives of new ARL member libraries, new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and guests of the Association.

Mr. Budington began the program by explaining its theme, "Changing Objectives in Research Libraries."

CHANGING OBJECTIVES IN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

MR. BUDINGTON: Those of you with a sharp eye and a retentive memory will have noted certain similarities between this morning's program and some of our proceedings last May in New Orleans. The key word in the titles and the themes of both meetings has been "change." Last Spring's approach was one of trying to cope, and we recognized that there was considerable evidence that our Association and our profession were making at least nominal efforts to initiate and not just react to change. It is our hope that this morning's program elements, as well as some rather significant matters which will come up in our business meeting this afternoon, will provide further evidence and stimulation to this process of growth and evolution.

This morning's program has to do with the changing objectives in research libraries. We have assembled a distinguished group of individuals here who will speak to this. I would like to introduce now our moderator for the first program element, Page Ackerman from UCLA.

* * * *

MS. ACKERMAN: Our two speakers are Hugh Atkinson, Director of Libraries at The Ohio State University and Richard Boss, Director of Libraries at the University of Tennessee. They will cover the following topics under the major subject of "Changing Objectives in Research Libraries." The topics are: Patron Definition of Objectives, Change in Management Style, Structuring for Choice, Planning Techniques, Shifting Resources, and Non-Print. Our discussants are Ben Bowman, Director of Libraries at the University of Rochester, Richard Chapin, Director of Libraries at Michigan State University and Arthur Hamlin, Director of Libraries at Temple University. We will begin the program with Mr. Atkinson, who will discuss Patron Definition of Objectives.

MR. ATKINSON: The traditional definition of the library's objective as supporting research is no longer in our hands or in my hands or in the hands of the staff of Ohio State University, but in the hands of the patron -- the students and faculty that we serve. Their objectives may focus, not on the kinds of things that made viable the support of instruction and research, but will focus on what makes them happy. We have always had that conflict between the short-term and the long-term good, and we obviously have not done such a good job of defining the long-term good that changes so often. So it seems to me that not only is it a more responsive, but it is probably a better technique in the long run to respond directly.

The patron definition of objectives is made known to us through such things as the suggestion boxes -- the little letters that we get pointing out why we should not circulate psychology journals and at the same time, whey we should chemistry journals. The patron definition of objectives is expressed through a whole series of meetings in the faculty clubs and in the student gatherings, as the graduate student complains about teaching assistants who do not have faculty privileges and deserve them, since they are doing the same kinds of work as the people with formal instructional rank, and so forth.

One of the changing jobs of a university librarian is to referee many of these conflicting or seemingly contradictory ways of making people happy bibliographically. It does seem to have something to do with survival, with the kinds of responses that we see as being appropriate for libraries that are different, or at least the responses are phrased differently when they are spoken to the group that we serve. I also believe that many of the responses are exactly the same but are worded differently.

There are I think also some serious differences, in that there are things that we have not emphasized, but our patrons do. Certainly one of them is speed. It seems to me there is no doubt that the speed of response is perhaps the single area where we are most at variance with our patrons. We have always considered things for the long run. Time means a little less to us perhaps than to someone who is a student for four years. Probably if you look at it very closely, most of the students have been on a campus only three quarters and spend only about six quarters or two years on a particular campus. The transfer situation is overlooked when we have tried to analyze our students. Our faculties in fact change far more often than it seems, since we tend to deal with senior, stable faculty groups, rather than that mass of changing assistant professors, who may borrow far more than we realize, since they borrow in six item blocks, not 200 item blocks. The speeds that we are used to dealing with tend to be in the order of 13 to 14 weeks -- the typical loan periods for faculty borrowing. Consider the time it takes to get a book purchased from a normal American vendor; the four months that it takes us to catalog; the six days that it takes us to put a journal on the shelves, having checked it in a central serial record and then shipped it to the department library. Our patrons have a different attitude regarding acceptable speed than we do. They and we are governed by the Bell Telephone System which has perhaps an 11 second time of response. You and I get very upset if we do not hear a dial tone in about three to six seconds, and we do not get the number in about 11 seconds.

MR. HAMLIN: I just want to point out that we at the same time have to depend more and more on research materials, and we are depending on networks and availability of lesser-used research materials that will be available through such agencies as the Center for Research Libraries. There is more and more research materials that we do not have on our campus.

MR. ATKINSON: You are implying that that is a significantly slower system than we have on our individual campus, and is going to cut down the speed, because you do not have the material right on the campus. You are assuming

I think a fair delay because that is what our experience has been.

Now the other thing is, that you are assuming that the system we are going to devise, because we are all cancelling our journals because we cannot afford them, will be just as slow as the old one. It seems to me that if we were really concerned with speed and not just access, that we would be devising different systems. It is not implicit in cooperation that it be slow. I think that when you go into cooperation assuming it is a slow system because it has always been so in the past, that it will inevitably come out a slow system. If we are going to respond, and if one of our objectives is speed, then we had better design faster interlibrary loan systems, fast networks. At least those networks would respond to the patrons and tell them, "Yes, you can have it," and it will appear in three days, when you cannot tell them, "Yes, you can have it in two minutes." It should be some kind of a system which incorporates some form of speed -- at least the report of whether he is going to get the material is given very quickly. That is one of the places where interlibrary loan has not been able to distinguish between the speed of the delivery and the sense of whether the system is going to work. I think that the speed question can be countered or at least dealt with, if it is a system that is a fast one, not just an available one, not just broad coverage, but fast coverage.

MR. CHAPIN: You began this whole thing by saying that you were going to get your objectives out of the suggestion box and then you went into speed. My suggestion box never was really concerned much with speed, but with publications that we have or do not have. Are you saying that we should put our money right now where the patrons want it to go? I would hate to replace you five years from now, because your library will not have anything for the future if you follow this line of thinking.

MR. ATKINSON: You are assuming that the future is what we have been doing. There is no human way to plan for future use. I do not see the active researcher as being so slow. Our demands for speed are just as often from the research community as they are from the student community, in fact, they may be a little heavier.

MR. CHAPIN: Patrons come in different sizes and shapes. Junior stock clerks, library faculty, university administration, legislators, citizens of the community are all constituencies, and I think one has to be responsive to some degree to all of them. The problem arises when there are conflicting notions, including the director's own notions, of the objectives. The question is, how does a director of libraries avoid the role of cosmic judge, of having to choose when the notes in the suggestion box say one thing, one's staff says another, one's administration says another, and yet one's legislature says another thing. Under those circumstances how do you make people happy bibliographically?

MR. ATKINSON: I did not want to dwell too much on this, but the suggestion box is not the only place. Probably the second most frequent suggestion is pleasant service. Our patron groups are demanding that we be nice, have a sense of openness, a sense of warmth in dealing with them.

MR. CHAPIN: Well, as far as this matter of changing style is concerned, the patrons' expectations are constantly changing ones, and if one involves staff more than they have ever been involved before, those people who never complained about not being involved, now speak very, very vigorously indeed when anything of interest to them passes them by. Thus the director finds himself on a vehicle whose speed is increasing and which he ceases to control.

MR. ATKINSON: But there are tricks, if you will, on the question of changing management styles. There are proven symbols that people do interpret. The question of how big a desk seems to me to be one of those symbols that you can change. That is, you can not have a desk. We know that the question of people sitting behind a barrier talking to somebody in a chair lower than the chair that the authority figure is using, is one that is generally recognized. So you can use that trick: no desk but the same level chair to provide the symbols necessary for openness, if that is what you wish to do. You can go out of your way either by dress or by tone to deliberately set up the kind of symbols that we all live with.

MR. CHAPIN: We are faced with the situation of multiple constituencies. Many choices are available. How do you go about really setting up the mechanism that is going to make it possible for you to make what hopefully will be the right choices?

MR. HAMLIN: So far today we have given up the plain objectives; we are going to let the patrons define objectives, and we have given up decision making. Now, where do we go from here?

MR. ATKINSON: The decision making probably is not given up. The thing is that you have a far broader range of decisions to make, a far wider spectrum of choices, more constituencies, more suggestions from the suggestion box and so forth. You have more letters, more alternatives to doing something, more places that you can make choices and they are often conflicting. Not everybody is as wise as everyone else. Not every patron has the same judgement as every other patron. It does seem to me that you have to have the kind of structure that provides the ability for the Circulation Department to make those choice, and the choices may be on a level such as, shall we have a separate line to charge out the graduate students' books, or what may well be the most important choice, how shall we spend limited budgets? How do we choose among those previously allocated parts of the budget? Can we manipulate them?

It strikes me that one of the great challenges, one of the great problems, is to match the objectives and the money. The money may be there to meet some of the objectives that seem to be more important now, but it is already tied up in the Bindery, Catalog Department, in the Undergraduate Library, in the book funds, in the serial funds and so forth. Moving money around I have found extraordinarily difficult; and it becomes a time consuming problem even to get agreement. It is very easy to get agreement that we should do something, and it is a little more difficult but it does happen, that we should do X before Y, but then to move the money from Y to X, becomes almost impossible. It seems to me that the structure we should be trying to develop is one of providing the essential base of support within the library staff itself, or the university community when it comes to those items which are in public view, and to be able to make those transfers of money from one fund to another fund as objectives change. The amount of general information for education has to be of a hugh volume throughout a large campus so that the constituencies, both internal and external, know the rationale behind the choice and the decision to move money from one place to another.

MR. BOSS: I would like to get a clear picture of that structure. You started a moment ago with some questions: Shall we do this, shall we do that? Is your structure such that staff is going to help you provide answers to that, or be structured in such a way that they have time to do it? What about this structure?

MR. ATKINSON: The structure seems to be shifting and to be varied. There may be quarterly meetings of the various library committee chairmen to talk about those things, such as the increasing serial budget, and where we are going to get money to pay for it. In that case for instance, one would try to get some sense of general agreement that such an item is more important perhaps than catalogs. Now that does not speak to the needs of the catalogers or to somebody else, but with that bit of information there is another structure, the Library Council or the Executive Committee or the Staff Conference or the Advisory Committee, where that kind of information has to be passed on, reviewed and the conflict brought out. There may well be a third and fourth structure which deals with such an activity.

Somewhere the director comes to a decision about where, how much and whether it is right, and transmits it back or provides a general explanation of the reasons for the choice and where the money is coming from, with enough safeguards so that you do not make the wrong choice. I think that is one of the real problems of the general consultative structures: Will they protect us from making the wrong choices more often than not? I think society right now is really a strained one. We cannot agree on objectives. I do not know how long any set of objectives will last.

MR. BOSS: Well, even if they do not last very long, I think that individuals who have been involved, who have had a chance to speak up in the development of such objectives, are more supportive of those objectives. Objectives when developed by a library director or by a library administration and announced, just do not get the kind of support that library objectives do which have been developed with input from faculty, students, junior staff, senior staff and others.

MR. ATKINSON: The masses are the hardest to build into that structure for choice. There are some questions that must be answered speedily even though I agree in general that the formulation of policy may have a different speed necessity than provision of services. Even then the apparent slowness of library response to administrative needs or to budgetary needs or to the research and instructional needs has been a problem on most of our campuses.

MR. CHAPIN: Do you have a mechanism or do you envision a mechanism on a staff through which continuous development of continuing objectives could go on? I am interested in the cement of structures. Why are they? I think there could very well be a series of continuing objectives developed by a staff in conference or via a suggestion box, if you will, but one of the things that qualifies people, it seems to me, to make these kinds of decisions and to work under stress, is some experience at that level.

MR. ATKINSON: Part of that does demand that we redefine the expectations we all have of ourselves and our colleagues in the library of how much work we get out of people. How much time can we afford to spend or have the staff spend on doing that kind of thing? I think the same questions are being raised about how much time can a staff spend doing research. How much time can they spend on committees and so forth? I think time is really the problem. You do not have to hire a new person to do this -- an information specialist who reports to the director or so forth. It has to do somehow with the redefining as to what was going to happen during the 40's and 50's with most of the instructional faculty, when the 15 and 16 hour loads drop to six to eight? Somehow the classes were still met and a re-definition was made of how much time a particular member of the faculty was expected to spend in the classroom. I think we have to redefine what a librarian is. How much time should a reference librarian spend at his desk? How much time should a cataloger catalog?

MR. BOSS: You know, there was that phrase "POSDCORB" in Public Administration a few years ago that everybody memorized in an effort to remember the various aspects of management, and one of them was planning, another was controlling. It seems to me that the more time you spend on that element of planning, of involving people in deliberations at the front end, the less time you spend at the back end controlling and following up to see why people did not do what you wanted them to do, or what it was decided that they ought to do. You are going to spend the time in all probability one way or the other, and frankly I think it is beyond the realm of possibility to go around checking up on people to see whether they are really doing the things that the policy memorandum says they should do. They really have to have some commitment of their own to make those policies work, rather than having us play the role of policemen. In terms of planning, I think we have always planned, in formal ways too, in terms of preparation of budget documents that are planning devices. But the concept of planning is becoming more and more formalized, and it is becoming more significant in our libraries.

There is the recognition that planning is a process that involves a very systematic, structured examination of the environments in which we operate, the various forces that are at work, the choices we have available, of involving the many different constituencies that are affected by the decisions that are reached, of attempting to shape those not only in the short-range for the current year, in the midrange for three to five years, but even in the long-range. The effectiveness of utilizing these processes in terms of this choice determination, I think is substantial in several ways.

First of all, when that individual patron comes in and complains about this or that, to be able to point out that there was patron invovlement in the development of the objective of which this particular goal or this particular policy or procedure is a part becomes significant. And then it is effective when one can indicate that it is possible for that objective to be changed, by extending an invitation to place it on the agenda of the next meeting of the library advisory committee, or the graduate student association, or the faculty committee. So the fact that there is an opportunity to bring about change, providing the individual is willing to make the commitment to work toward that change, is one way of deferring a potentionally difficult situation, although that certainly is not the sole justification for it.

I think also right now is a particularly good time to engage in more formal planning, involving a large number of people on our various campuses, because so many of our parent institutions do not plan, at least not in the formal sense. Our university administrators are really better reactors than they are shapers of the campus environment. Given a well-conceived plan, one that has been developed with the many constituencies of the library, presented to the university administration, there seems to be a tendency to accept the plan, because there are really few other alternatives as carefully developed. There are evidences that many of the units on our campus are beginning to adopt formal techniques for short, middle and long-range planning.

We are going to be in the advantageous position of having the numbers and the options worked out, of having the support of many segments of the university community for the objectives that we have developed, because these people have been involved. After you have spent 10 or 15 hours at meetings talking about something, somehow you seem to have an investment in achieving some results.

MR. ATKINSON: I have noticed at a fair number of institutions that if an alternative or a program, is not mentioned in a six-year or four-year or two-year plan, somebody will say, we will not fund it because it is not mentioned. Somehow the kind of planning we should do should provide for a whole series of alternatives, because we are really going to get locked into those state-wide or campus-wide plans, and it becomes very difficult to break through that structure, so I point out that there are dangers in these formal submitted plans.

MR. HAMLIN: I have been waiting for a word to crop up in this discussion of Planning and Structuring for Change about this terribly important aspect of communication, both of faculty and staff. There are all sorts of ways of communicating; we all have our individual styles. It may be largely through committees, through faculty meetings, through letters and so on, but there simply has to be communication. One of the important things in planning is to let your plans be known, and this invites the reaction which is so important.

MR. ATKINSON: You know we were talking about shifting resources just a moment ago, and I would like to say just a few more things about that. I think that there are three basic financial shifts going on, whether we notice them or not, throughout the library world. They are from materials to people, from people to computers, and from professionals to nonprofessionals.

Now that first shift may sound very questionable. The inflation and the cost of library materials makes it very difficult to see that shift, day-to-day but I still think it is going on. As we cancel subscriptions, as we cut back as so many of us are in the number of items that can be purchased, even though the budgets may be growing somewhat (and we face what looks like a 25% increase in the serial budget next year), simple transfers of book funds to serial accounts are not going to work any longer, and have not been working in the last year. We would be more aware of it if the Serial Division were not holding back the bills only to surprise us at the end of the year. To make the networks work, to make the cooperative activities work, to make the more limited current purchasing work, will demand even further erosion of those materials funds and a transfer of them to people. This will happen either through planning or it will happen just by accident.

The recommendations of a Reference Department for another reference librarian will be met by the appointment of a clerk or an English graduate instead of another reference librarian. We will make this change $6,000 dollars at a time or piece by piece, and perhaps poorly, not making the right choices somewhere. Or we will do it with some sort of rationale trying to pick those areas of the campus community that need more personal service, or we will simply respond to the first request, but I think it is inevitable.

At the same time I think that money for people is being transferred to money for computers. Basically, by computers I mean things like the Ohio College Library Center. Now you may define such activities as cooperation or networks, but they are things that have to be paid for from catalog budgets or personnel budgets. We have tended to say we are getting all this extra benefit, and it now only costs us $2.32 or something like that figure to catalog a volume. If we catalog the same 49,000 titles next year, we will have enough money by not hiring another cataloger to pay the O.C.L.C. $50,000 dollars or whatever it might be next year.

I suspect that each regional and state network is going to be funded that way. As I said, the first piece will be technical services costs, personnel costs, where we justify to ourselves and to the rest of the staff that the reason we have fewer people is because the machine-based network is really doing their job, and that is how we fund them. I also think that this will occur in other parts of the library system, other parts of the personnel budget. It may well occur in the public services when we start dealing with more sophisticated automated techniques for circulation, for serial check-in, for serial use in the various libraries, and occasionally for some kinds of reference services, and perhaps some kinds of bibliographic verification and so forth.

At the same time there will be far more nonprofessionals on the staff. It strikes me as extraordinarly more difficult to talk about the professionals as becoming more managers and less doers than it seemed at one time. We have not yet defined the difference between managing and doing, of controlling or supervising and doing, in such a way that it works.

MR. BOSS: I would like to add to the matter of shifting resources from printed materials which has been our traditional concern, to a broader concept of recorded knowledge that includes nonprint materials. It seems to me we are missing an opportunity if we do not recognize that the printed word will be augmented by other forms of recorded information that are useable by individual patrons on a one-to-one basis. I am not talking about the library producing audio tapes or slides or video tapes or films any more than the library prints books. I am not talking about the library providing equipment for classroom instructional support, or providing the operators thereof. I am talking instead about the acquisition, for instance, of census data on magnetic tape that is machine-readable, because it is easy to manipulate and faster to obtain than that data in the traditional ten-year printed census.

I am talking about an audio tape of a play or a poem or an interview or a speech, because a fireside chat by Franklin D. Roosevelt has much more meaning when heard, than when read in a textbook. I am talking about a set of slides of botanical specimens, of geological specimens, of art objects or architecture or what have you. I am talking about video cassettes of great dramas or of significant historical events. Faculty members often have the opportunity in making a selection, to choose whether or not to purchase yet another definitive edition of Shakespeare or to acquire a video cassette of a truly distinguished company performing a Shakespearean play.

Really we ought to change this hierarchy of values regarding printed materials which I think we have traditionally maintained. We say that at such a time when we are separately funded to move into nonprint materials, we will undertake to do this, but that time will probably not come in most of our institutions. It is time for us to recognize that information in various formats ought to be selected on the basis of the most appropriate medium. Frankly, I cannot imagine a more appropriate medium for a novel than a printed book with which one can curl up in front of a fireplace. On the other hand, I cannot think of a less appropriate medium for the U.S. Census than a printed book, and I cannot think of a less appropriate medium for a great historical interview with a key personality in history than a printed book. For these purposes the video tape has an extraordinary ability to give the individual a feeling of involvement with that particular event in history. I think this is another shifting resource.

MR. ATKINSON: I am one of those people who believe that microfilm is an idea whose time has come and gone, and I have been somewhat distrustful of audio visual devices, mostly for two reasons: most of the time they do not work, and the rest of the time they are very expensive to maintain, to keep them working. There is the problem of not having a stable expenditure. You buy a machine and you have to keep buying and buying it over again, and that does demand some kind of replacement fund.

But from what small knowledge I have of audio visual things, I am impressed with the growing use of the video cassette. It works for a library. Unlike a motion picture projector and similar equipment that never really works for the fundamental activity of a library, providing an individual item to an individual user as opposed to group showings and discussions, video cassettes do seem to work for individuals. It is a surprise to me, but I would predict, at least for us, a much heavier pressure to deal with video-taped lectures, interviews, other kinds of material, where basically students come in and check it out and play it on a machine, in the same way they have always used a reserve book. That is different from most of the AV materials.

MR. HAMLIN: I just want to make the point that on my campus we have had a lot of discussion recently of this report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education,[1] which emphasizes in the strongest terms our needs to use the media in higher education. One of the principal difficulties that we have, and perhaps some of you have, is in organizing staff and services to handle these materials. I do not particularly want to take into the library all the learning devices that the College of Education would like to use and does use. Drawing the lines and setting up the administrative patterns is a real difficulty with us. I do not know how it is going to come out.

---

[1] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Fourth Revolution; Instructional Technology in Higher Education. Hightstown, N.J., McGraw Hill Book Co., June 1972.

MR. BOSS: To a very large extent I think it is a matter of the familiarity that one has with these materials. One tends to make assumptions based on one's own background. I would guess that all of us share a basic impression that nonprint materials are more expensive to acquire and maintain than printed materials, and yet, that is not the case necessarily. For example, we were spending a great deal of money at the University of Tennessee on the purchase of expensive art books which contain plates of paintings that were part of art appreciation courses enrolling 1,700 students. We got multiple copies of each and placed them on reserve in the conventional fashion. Nothing we could do could avoid purchasing half a dozen or more replacement copies of each title each year, as the plates were systematically removed from the art volumes. Finally we photographed these art reproductions, put them on slides, made two or three copies of each one, sealed the individual slides in carousels so that they could not be opened or tampered with, and then checked them out and allowed the individuals to go to any one of 20 slide projectors with a small screen, and view these slides at any speed, and for that matter in any sequence, because the individual could skip back and forth.

Our investment for just that art appreciation program alone has been cut by more than one half as a result of discontinuing the practice of buying multiple copies of books containing these art plates and shifting to slides. Use has now gone up to more than 600 to 700 such uses a week by these art students, where formerly the figures on circulation of the art books were running about 200 to 300 a week.

MR. CHAPIN: If we tie this whole thing together in terms of what objectives are and how we define objectives and so forth, we will find out that we all say we are going to meet the information needs in curriculum and research for the University. What we really get back to is, what we do is what we have been doing. We have got some goals, we have got some objectives, and I do not see how these are changing objectives. There may be changing emphasis on these, but I certainly do not think that objectives are something that we put out today, and tomorrow we change them at a faculty meeting or a student council meeting or something like that. The focus of this whole discussion is the changing objectives, and I do not think objectives have changed. I think the objectives are pretty much what we have always had.

MS. ACKERMAN: I think we have reached the perfect place to end the discussion by the discussants and the speaker, since we have now covered the field, and have come from alpha to omega.

* * * *

RESEARCH LIBRARIES AND TECHNOLOGY: SOME FORCES FOR CHANGE

Herman H. Fussler
University of Chicago Graduate Library School

MR. BUDINGTON: The second half of the program this morning deals also with some aspects of change, and as you will note from the program, we are getting down to grips with forces this time, the title being "Research Libraries and Some Forces For Change." Our principal speaker will be our long time friend Herman Fussler, who has spent considerable time in recent months analyzing these forces. The discussants will be Richard De Gennaro from the University of Pennsylvania and Frederick Wagman of the University of Michigan.

* * * *

MR. FUSSLER: I am honored by the invitation to return from what some of my erstwhile colleagues here regard as the idyllic pastoral grove of academia. That pastoral grove has one consequence: I have been teaching more years than I care to tell any of you about, and it leads to a pattern in which all intellectual units can be packaged in an hour and a half. The trivial ones take an hour and a half and the long ones take an hour and a half, so prepare yourself.

While it was not made altogether explicit, I assume that my assignment here is to describe, to outline, or even to try to defend a report -- unfortunately delayed in publication -- dealing with the subject of libraries and technology.

By way of introduction, it may be useful to indicate some of the circumstances that led to the report's preparation. In the autumn of 1971, I was asked by the Alfred Sloan Foundation if I would prepare a report on the current status and potentials of technology in relation to libraries. The proposal for such a report came from a Panel established by the Foundation to examine the current status, potentials and problems of technology in relation to education. The Panel had concluded that it might be useful to recognize the role of libraries in the context of their more general assignment.

During the past decade there have been, as you well know, many other reports on libraries and technology, some of them presenting very large-scale analytical efforts. The King report on the Library of Congress, the various System Development Corporation reports, the Wigington report, and the Conference Board report on Information Technology are examples. It is, or at least was, legitimate to ask whether there could be any possible justification for another, and more limited and modest, effort?

After some discussion with the Panel, I concluded that another report could be justified -- if at all -- only if it tried to examine the issues in terms of several conditions or limitations: first, it seemed important to try to recognize the long-term technological potentials, but the report should be focused primarily on the near-term possibilities. This was because all kinds of technological potentials seem to be feasible if one pushes the effective date for utilization far enough into the future, or if one is willing to ignore, or to be casual about, costs. Such a limitation implicitly also has the effect of reducing advantageously the number of technologies that need to be assessed. Secondly, it seemed potentially useful to explore significant changes in the library that might be feasible without large-scale federal funding. While such funding would be highly advantageous, it may or may not become available. It is essential nonetheless that we deal with some very serious problems. Lastly, it seemed essential that technology be examined, not in isolation, but in the general context of (a) technological potentials; (b) basic library trends, economic pressures, and existing or prospective library operational restraints or limitations; and (c) the library's current and prospective responsiveness to users' needs. I thought that the task of trying to place the library in this somewhat larger context would not only help in the identification of priorities, but might also be useful to the Sloan Panel which had on it no librarians, but did include a very knowledgeable group of members. The work of the Panel was organized in such a way that it did not appear necessary for my report to go into instructional technologies or multi-media technologies. Thus the report, as finally drafted, deals with a variety of alternatives that are not technological in nature. Furthermore, the focus is primarily on the problems of the larger research-oriented libraries. The rationale for this last limitation is an assumption that major improvements in the operation of the large research-oriented libraries would tend to offer potential spin-off benefits for smaller libraries, while the reverse situation seems much less likely.

The report begins with a highly synoptic summary of the conclusions of most of the major reports on libraries and technology of the past decade. Based in part on this review, a number of general conclusions and observations were offered that shaped, in considerable measure, the balance of the report. These observations or conclusions may be worth summarizing, for not everyone will agree with all of these points.

1. There appears to be a very strong consensus that some technologies are presently relevant to information and literature access and to library operations. There seems to be less agreement on priorities, the scale or levels of application, and the most suitable strategies for bringing about major changes or improvements.

2. In these studies the primary rationale for the recommended changes seems to be related to the need for sharp improvements in the responsiveness of library and information-access systems. Net, overall cost reductions, or cost stabilization, if in prospect, seem to have been given a somewhat lower priority in most of the cited studies. However, the

expectation of substantially improved cost/effectiveness ratios *is* stated or strongly implied in virtually all of these reports.

3. The capital investment required to bring about a reasonably rapid, large-scale alteration of existing information and library-access systems is not stated in a number of the reports. Where stated, as in the System Development Corporation study or in the King report on the automation of the Library of Congress, the amounts seem substantial. However, when examined in terms of total aggregate library expenditures, cancer research, space flights, a nuclear-powered submarine, or a variety of other expenditures, the amounts seem relatively small. Furthermore there are some ominous library trends and fiscal support problems that may result in the assignment of greater values to technology in relation to ultimate cost stabilization -- if not reduction.

4. As the "Wigington" report indicates: "The primary bar to development of national computer-based library and information systems is no longer basically a technology-feasibility problem. Rather it is the combination of complex institutional and organizational human-related problems and the inadequate economic/value system associated with these activities." These problems have not been solved. No strong national mechanism for the effective analysis of needs, long-term systems planning, or implementation of new and larger systems of information/literature access has emerged. Indeed, too strong or authoritarian a mechanism would be unacceptable. Yet it is evident that some common, coherent services and functions, including planning, are needed to build a more effective national system of information and literature access. The Conference Board study on information technology asserts that this is likely to be a very serious problem for the entire information-access field.

5. There have been technical, design, priority, and intellectual problems that have proved more intractable and difficult than was anticipated ten or so years ago.

6. It has become increasingly evident that successful, large-scale, computer software systems to handle complex data-access requirements cannot be developed independently by every large (or small) library or discipline-oriented professional society. There simply is not enough money, and the functional need for such extreme variation has not been demonstrated and is highly improbable.

7. It has been difficult to transfer existing capabilities from one computer or institutional environment to another, and some projects have been criticized because they were not "transferable." The criticism may be premature or inappropriate if directed to some technical capabilities that are still being developed in prototype applications. There have been, of course, classical difficulties in the general transfer of reasonably high-efficiency software systems from one computer environment to another. There are now emerging a number of possible solutions to this problem.

8. Few, if any, of the large-scale, national, library-related system recommendations contained in these various reports have been carried out, though some large-scale literature- or data-oriented systems are now operational, for example, in medicine, chemistry, toxicology, and nuclear energy.

9. It is probably reasonable to expect that the scholarly library and its staff will increasingly need to become a major point of access for factual data as well as bibliographical data and many other kinds of information. The classical concept of limiting the library's functions primarily to the selection, acquisition, organization, and servicing of a local collection of documents will not effectively meet the needs of an increasing number of users for either literature or data access.

10. There have been some important extensions in our general understanding of technical problems; some significant technological capabilities have been developed; some important progress has been made in developing standards for machine-based bibliographical data and in providing national access to such data; and many of the intellectual problems of organizing access to recorded information are becoming clearer.

11. Despite a few critical responses to technology, its alleged misuse, or its failure thus far to produce significant operating economies, the research library community has accepted, with varying degrees of knowledge or enthusiasm, the need for some basic changes in library procedures and operations, including more effective uses of technology. However, the view that there may need to be even more basic conceptual and operational changes in the ways that libraries function and provide access to recorded knowledge has perhaps not yet been generally accepted by either the library or the scholarly communities.

12. Some of the major reports on the current adequacy of disciplinary information access have pointed to rather severe deficiencies in the current literature control and related access systems.

13. There has, in general, been a failure to prepare one or more general models through which the requirements and purposes of libraries or library-information networks could be more clearly and systematically specified and examined in terms of existing and alternative capabilities and designs. This need has been recognized in several committee reports and by several individuals as being of great importance. Most of the cited studies note the importance of careful library systems analyses, of determining more precisely the extremely wide range of user needs, of recognizing the extreme variations in types of information and literature that must be made available, of developing schema to measure quantitatively the benefits derived from various systems and to compare the costs of new systems, and their stated benefits, with the costs and benefits of existing systems. There are serious gaps in theories of communication and information utilization. These matters are clearly difficult, but very important, as one examines the long-term potentials of technology and plans for new information-and literature-access systems.

14. Although it is not stressed in these reports, it is evident that technology is only one of many measures that need to be taken to improve access to literature and information. There are a variety of essentially nontechnological measures or changes that could equal or even exceed the immediate values of technology in the improvement of such access. A limited number of these alternatives are discussed in this report.

15. For those who may be disturbed by the prospects of technology, it may be worth noting that these studies rather strongly imply that the major improvements and changes sought can best be achieved in an evolutionary manner, that many basic library functions are critically important, and that these functions are very unlikely to be quickly or easily superseded by some simple -- or even sophisticated -- technology. However, it is equally essential to observe that there are also stated and implied criticisms of the library and its effectiveness that must be taken very seriously.

We clearly have the means for bringing about some very large-scale and basic improvements in our concepts and methods of access to recorded knowledge and information. There are

> critical needs for such improvements, although it may not presently be possible to demonstrate the benefits of such changes in economic or other quantifiable ways. The achievements of such improvements will require money, improved organizational mechanisms, a clearer consensus on goals and priorities, more adequate planning, and prototype developmental, testing, and evaluative efforts.
>
> There are reasons to believe that the gap between readers' needs and the response capabilities of the large research-oriented academic library has been increasing, and is likely to increase even more rapidly in the next decade unless some basic changes can be made in library concepts and capabilities. Furthermore, the prospects for short-term, large reductions in library costs, to be accompanied by large-scale increases in capability, simply through the use of technology as applied to existing library processes, seem relatively dim. In order to achieve significant improvements in the quality or scope of information access or library cost/effectiveness ratios, more basic changes will be required than the "simple" technological replication of many existing library routines and processes.

The second section of the report was an effort to examine a variety of current aspects of the large university library. These matters, and at least some of the conclusions about them, are entirely familiar to this audience but many of the critical issues, and especially their potential long-term consequences, are, I think, perhaps not as well understood by scholars, university administrators, federal agencies, the officers of major foundations, or the general public, as one might wish. A major portion of this section of the report examines critically the trends in collection growth rates, total library operating costs, the expenditures for books, and staff expenditures. An effort is made to relate these data to institutional expenditures and to several pertinent cost indexes. The data seem to me quite ominous, and I conclude that some of you -- but surely not all -- share this view. The data suggest recent levels of increases in expenditures (e.g. 10-12% per year, compounded) that I think cannot be sustained by most academic institutions. Even with this high rate of expenditure there is a declining capability to keep up with the growth of literature and other users' requirements. [At the time of this analysis, I did not know that the Council on Library Resources had asked William Baumol to undertake a new study of academic library economic trends.] Happily, Baumol's general conclusions were similar to those I had reached independently. Baumol's general conclusions were given in these words:

> The analysis of cost trends just described shows that the observed behavior of costs of library operations and of related activities cannot be considered a chance occurrence.

> The trends arise at least in considerable part out of the nature of the technology involved and hence they can be expected, with a considerable degree of confidence, to continue for the foreseeable future.
>
> These cost changes are likely to have a revolutionary impact on the nature of library operations, and the general outlines of these changes can be anticipated. Increased sophistication in technology and recourse to automated equipment may be unavoidable within a matter of decades. So profound a change can be extremely disturbing to the orderly functioning of libraries unless steps are taken early to plan for the transition and to assure that its advent occurs in an organized manner.

I share Baumol's general conclusion that sophisticated technologies are highly relevant, but I differ in my estimate of the time available for bringing about some major changes. We do not, I think, have decades, unless we are prepared to accept some very serious degradations in the quality or extent of library-based research literature and information access systems. Secondly, I am persuaded that some of the required critical changes are not basically technological, as Baumol seems to imply -- though I recognize he may be using the term in a very much wider sense.

If one is faced with seemingly unacceptable cost increases and real, or threatened, degradation of the actual or potential quality and scope of services and resources, logic suggests that one must look to see where the money is now going. In the research library -- as we all know -- it seems, with some remarkable institutional variations to be very neatly divided into about one-third for the purchase of books and serials and other materials (with serials each year taking a higher and higher proportion of the available funds); another one-third goes into the acquisition, cataloging and related processing costs; and a final third is available for general services in reference, circulation, administration, etc. While the mathematics may look a bit curious, there is also about one-tenth left that goes for supplies, postage, telephones, and such things as trips to Chicago in January and Las Vegas in July or August. There are also, of course, space costs, but these are not large in comparison to those for acquisitions, processing, or general operations. This crude breakdown seems useful to me as a pointer to the areas where changes are likely to be needed if one is to produce a major economic impact.

One conclusion that now seems widely accepted -- though the degree of commitment is less certain -- has to do with the necessity for large research libraries to begin to develop highly effective means for sharing a very substantial proportion of the total corpus of literature and information, and other functions. The increasing body of literature and discussion of networks presumably reflects this view. However, in any discussion of networks it is an essential first step to examine what the resources -- broadly speaking -- at the network nodes will be and thus help to define what products are to be carried or delivered through what kinds of institutional systems or networks. The ultimate economic leverage of truly effective systems for sharing are theoretically very great because of the effect upon both purchase and processing costs. While I conclude from the contemporary literature and the remarks of my colleagues that there is now a general recognition of the need to share resources, I sense also that there is great ambivalence about the components to be shared, the optimal extent of such sharing, the means by which sharing can be optimally achieved, and the ultimate impact that effective systems of sharing might have on a) scholarship, b) libraries, and c) publication patterns, etc.

There are a variety of observations on these matters in the report that do not require repetition here. For the sharing of document or textual resources at the large, research-oriented, university library level, (*the qualifications are important*) I am persuaded that we need to distinguish between (1) the retrospective resources already held in one or more major libraries, and (2) current and future publications. For the former we need -- and are beginning to have -- some means for more effective bibliographical control coupled with at least some locational data. We also need loan-policy agreements, equitable support of the operation as between loaners and borrowers, radical simplification of the paper work, and greater speed and assurance of access.

For current and future publications, the situation is very different, and I believe a very strong case can be made for a highly centralized national system, that is, a system based upon one, or a very few, independent centers, which will develop -- gradually no doubt -- collections that will be as comprehensive as possible. These centers should probably have no other obligations than providing general and equitable access to the shared resources held. The issues of bibliographical control, access speeds, collection scope, queuing problems, funding, etc., are very complex and it is difficult to deal with all of them objectively, but to some degree many of the arguments can be reduced to a recognition that a back-up resource system to be optimally effective must offer to its users sufficient assurance of current *and future* access to a sufficiently large body of resources to justify and permit ultimately significant, long-term modifications in local acquisition policies. I am not persuaded that the many emerging decentralized systems based upon a small number of local institutions, a state, or a regional area can *effectively* meet this requirement at the large, research-oriented library level. It must be recognized in this connection that a portion of our problems here are related to a reconciliation of latent, or overt, elitist and egalitarian institutional and scholarly ambitions and pressures. I should also note that there is a very significant potential relationship between the quality, scope, and accessibility of a "national" bibliographical apparatus and the probable utility of a "back-up" documentary resource system.

Basic changes in document or textual resource access systems, of the kind suggested here, are not primarily dependent upon technology -- new or old. I doubt, for example, that facsimile transmission of textual data is a mandatory condition for effective current access to pooled resources. It could become very useful in the future, especially if wide-band channels were to be made cheaply and widely available. In the meantime the efficient loan of originals and, where appropriate, microform copies and electrostatic full-size copies are economically feasible and potentially responsive to many user needs.

Another segment of the report is focused upon the general problems of bibliographical control, with the bibliographical control of current monographic materials receiving the primary emphasis. Here, the proposal is made that we should give high priority to the development of an essentially new and sophisticated spectrum of bibliographical tools that would cover the contemporary and future literature -- initially exclusive of the content of serial publications. The initial source of data for such bibliographical control and the production of such tools would, of course, be an expanded, and highly current LC-NPAC and MARC program -- supplemented by inputs from other national and foreign bibliographic centers and agencies and major domestic sources. It is proposed that these data in machine-readable form be used for the generation of a wide range of bibliographical tools in terms of subject/language/geographic-origin/level of treatment/etc. The levels of subject analysis and classification could be as variable and as elaborate as user requirements indicated. The modes of access to such tools and the supporting data bases would include printed, telephone-directory-like tools, designed for institutions as well as individual users; similar computer-output-microform products where the market was more limited or the volume of material to be covered was very large; and computer-based batch and inter-active search and retrieval operations on the data base -- or segments of it -- when this would be most responsive to user requirements, whether institutional or personal.

The objectives to be sought from such a development would include the following: 1) a substantial, ultimate reduction in the very high costs for local library processing functions; 2) ultimately, a major reduction in the complexity and the growing inflexibilities of the local, traditional bibliographical apparatus (especially the card catalog) based upon institutional holdings; 3) the development of a bibliographical apparatus with a very high capability or potential for evolutionary and adaptive responses to changing literature and user requirements, with many modes of convenient access to the data base (or to suitable portions of it), and with greatly enhanced coverage, based upon the pertinent literature -- not upon the holdings of a particular institution.

There are, of course, many very difficult questions about the requirements, specifications, development, design, and funding of such a system, but it seems to me we have essentially the basic tools and knowledge required to start. In a sense the model (or models) for such a capability already exist in the bibliographical apparatus for the control of the content of some portions of the serial literature. While the analogy is not perfect, it may be useful to remind you of the present primary apparatus for the control of medical literature: one has Index Medicus coupled with a growing spectrum of specialized printed bibliographic tools, one has the MEDLARS data base for batch searches or for the generation of other specialized or recurring tools, and one has MEDLINE, as an interactive, national on-line search and retrieval facility. For the world's non-serial literature, the problems are not the same and the volume of literature to be controlled is much larger, but I believe the analogy or example is relevant. In time, we must also anticipate that the boundaries between factual data or information, document retrieval, and bibliographic data, will tend to blur into one another.

If such a system were to be developed, careful attention must be given to coupling the new generalized bibliographical tools to local library bibliographical tools or to the residual document control apparatus. This is necessary to avoid serious reader frustration in trying to secure cited documents not locally held, and to ease current user problems in the pursuit of literature that may be known to the user and that is, presumptively, locally held. Since initially most of the local bibliographical apparatus is likely to be drawn from the more general data base (at least for current publications), an automatic linkage of some kind would not be too difficult in these circumstances. It might, for example, be extremely helpful to build into all possible bibliographical systems -- including citations and footnotes in scholarly publications -- the International Standard Book Numbers or some similar device. This problem of document pursuit is now a costly one to users and libraries; we need to give it far more attention than we have. LC would prefer to see LC card numbers used for some of these linkages. However, the advantages to the user of the ISBN (or a title-based code) is that it is used internationally, and can be cited by any author referring to a work with such a number in it. This cannot be true of LC card numbers. I recognize that there are very serious bibliographical limitations in the present ISBN's, but I think some of the difficulties might be overcome by recognizing the problems in the design of the generalized bibliographical apparatus. For retrospective materials either the LC card numbers or the pre-1956 NUC numbers may be suitable. I assume that with this audience, I do not need to indicate that the development of the capabilities, so sketchily outlined here, is entirely dependent upon the imaginative and skillful use of computer-based data processing and the best of modern technologies for handling the outputs of such processing.

An obvious alternative to this proposal is to assume that a "local" bibliographical apparatus (or capability), based upon local holdings and drawn from the general data base, can be designed and maintained at equal or lower costs than the more general apparatus; and that such an apparatus, based upon locally held resources, will be preferable to the majority of users. This alternative deserves critical attention. I would guess that the stipulated competitive requirements could not be met, but I am not certain. In either case there will be residual processing functions that will still be essential to get books, journals, and other materials into libraries. I am persuaded that the bulk of these processes will be greatly facilitated, in the relatively near future, by machine data processing. The same thing will be true of many other routine operations in the service area, notably circulation, the processing of materials for reserve purposes, etc. I am much less certain, however, that it will make good economic sense over a long period of time -- to take only one example -- to use a potentially very powerful technology to print cards destined to be manually filed into huge card catalogs that are showing more and more signs of intellectual rigor mortis.

The computer, its problems, its potentials, and a few of its current library applications are dealt with at some length in the report -- and, I hope, with sufficient objectivity. There can be no doubt that mistakes have been made by libraries, by business, by government, and by other organizations in the effort to use computers either unwisely or prematurely. Yet many essential aspects of library use and operations seem to be so clearly related to the data processing capabilities of the computer that these processes will be seen as not only theoretically related to computers, but of a nature that is likely to make computer-based systems indispensable in the relatively near future for at least the larger libraries.

At the same time, it is neither necessary nor feasible for every library to embark independently on the design and development of a high-level, computer-based data processing system. Rather we probably need to develop what may appropriately be called a reasonable number of prototype, operational capabilities. We will then need to evaluate the prototypes with great care and objectivity in terms of their operational costs, their evolutionary prospects, their reliability, their capabilities, and other special features or characteristics. We will then need to ascertain how the most promising prototype capabilities -- assuming there are such -- can best be extended or utilized by all interested libraries. My guess is that a number of basic patterns of utilization may emerge ranging from systems based upon dedicated library or university-shared computers of various sizes, using packaged soft-ware systems; to systems where dedicated smaller computers are coupled to larger machines and data bases; and to systems where the computer facilities are centralized or interconnected to form some sort of shared network, with the local user gaining access to the system through suitable terminal devices. These questions need to be resolved by objective technical, economic, and performance analyses.

We need also to recognize that in addition to handling bibliographic data and general operational data processing, the computer, with properly designed systems can offer to libraries a very powerful and highly current management information capability that can help in the analysis of library performance, failure rates, resource allocation problems, and other aspects of operation.

There are, of course, technologies other than computers. As indicated earlier, the report does not attempt to cover audio-visual, or computer-aided-instruction, or cable TV technologies. However, it is obvious that a subsidized, national CATV network, should one emerge, could be quite significant for data transfer. The library literature these days seems to be giving much attention to network concepts with great emphasis on the means of communication or the design of the networks. It is important to recognize in this context that the nature of the data to be transferred, the resources at the network nodes, and the needs of users are the foundation elements for any network. The report does not deal with alternative methods of storing information in sophisticated photocopy or digital form. Although these areas are not dealt with, one must recognize that important new technological capabilities are always a possibility. The report does give some attention to textual access by means of facsimile transmission (and concludes that it is presently not very attractive) and to photocopying, including microforms.

Microforms continue to present tantalizing potentials and problems. The on-demand reproduction of microfiche for the individual user and the use of microfilm as primarily an intermediate storage medium prior to electrostatic full-size print-outs could offer some significant opportunities. The coupling of the computer's file storage and manipulation capabilities with optical character generators and microfilm or other photographic print-outs seems likely to be a very powerful technology, and possibly one of extraordinary importance to libraries in the handling of bibliographical data.

It may soon be essential for libraries, scholarly bodies, and others to examine much more seriously than they have alternative methods of distributing scholarly information and literature. The library in a sense is an involuntary partner to a process that seems in some ways to be less and less efficient and more and more costly. For example, we could now obviously develop mechanisms for the diffusion of scholarly "publications" that could completely by-pass the problems of fair use in relation to copyright. These issues are not dealt with in the report.

I do not see the near-term evolution of information-access systems that will effectively eliminate the library by providing to all users, wherever located, instant access to all recorded information and literature, in suitable form, three dimensions, and living color, at zero cost. At the same time, I cannot see the major, research libraries of ten or twenty years hence, operating in quite the same quasi-self-sufficient way that they have operated during the past several decades -- in some respects with great success it should be noted. The brave new world seems likely to be somewhere in between. The major criteria (or forces) for shaping the changes will include: the needs of users; the forces of economics, including those of scale; the existence and skillful identification and utilization of relevant technologies; the effectiveness of library operations and services; the rate of growth of literature and information; and the perception and wisdom of librarians. Our most difficult problems may be related to those of finding a constructive or viable consensus on the nature of the problems, the objectives to be sought, the priorities to be assigned, the means of funding, and, perhaps above all, the organizational structures required.

I have the impression that the current economic pressures will not quickly vanish -- indeed, they may worsen; and that these pressures, in combination with other factors, may be placing the larger research libraries in greater jeopardy than is commonly realized in terms of the recent past and in terms of user-anticipated levels of library performance. At the same time, it seems to me that we have the potential means, through the wise development and use of suitable technologies, new bibliographical systems, and the effective sharing of resources, for some very important, long-term, constructive changes in our systems of access to recorded knowledge and information that could be of major significance for education, scholarship, and human understanding.

* * * *

Discussion

MR. WAGMAN: I had hoped for some years that somebody would do a judicious study of the possibilities that technology offers for solving our problems, both as an offset to the Sunday supplement journalism on the subject we have all had to contend with, and to point the directions for us to follow. I think Herman Fussler's study, although it is much broader than this, meets these requirements beautifully, and I am grateful for it. I am sure we all will be.

Mr. Fussler takes off in his paper from the statement that we have reason to believe that the gap between reader needs and the response capability of the research-oriented libraries is increasing, and is likely to continue to increase in the next decade. He has been very cautious about this, less cautious than I would be. It is perfectly true that the rate of increase of funds going into research and the number of people engaged in research enterprises has been exponential all through the 60's and into the 70's. As Mr. Fussler told you, the amount of money that has been going into research libraries during this past nine years at least, has also been exponential. Despite this, it might be worth mentioning, if it is not obvious to everybody, that academic library staffs have doubled in nine years, and expenditures have tripled in the past nine years. But despite the fact that both areas have increased exponentially, there has remained a gap between our service capabilities and users' needs. I think that by continuing to increase the way we have been, we will not fill that gap.

Furthermore, it is perfectly true as we learned from Louis Ridenour's Law of Social Change, that all human activities that tend to increase exponentially eventually reach a saturation point, and the curve describing the increase tends to flatten out. This of course explains why we are not eventually going to be spending the total gross national product on research, and it also explains why Fremont Rider fell off the train when he predicted that in the year 2040 Yale University Library would engage 6000 catalogers to add 12 million volumes a year to the 200 million that it already had. The curve is flattening out right now it seems to me, in terms of increased library growth. Whether the curve is flattening out in regard to research investment I am not so sure, but apparently not as rapidly as it is with respect to libraries. Obviously we are going to be in trouble, and we are going to have to do something about it.

I am most interested in the fact that in prefacing his excellent analysis of the various measures that may be taken to improve access to literature and information, Mr. Fussler says that the nontechnological means may equal or even exceed the immediate values of technology in the improvement of such access. One of these means, of course, is going to have to be a better system for evaluating literature that is published, and more precise measures of relevance between literature, information and user needs. Mr. Fussler does not expatiate on this, and certainly this is a thorny thicket. We all carry a surplus of material that is irrelevant to the research that is going on, or likely to go on at our universities. We buy in anticipation of needs. We have never devised a system for knowing well in advance what programs are going to be developed at our universities. Even the knowledge of what programs are going to be developed does not give us the information as to what specifically we will need.

There is also a need for a reform in the system of publication it seems to me. This is an old horse that has been beaten often enough, but certainly what is going on now is becoming intolerable, and there is relatively little experimentation. There is some publication now in microform, and one small organization started experiementing some years ago and is continuing to produce an abstract bulletin with the articles that are abstracted available for order in microform.

I think the most important nontechnological recommendation in Mr. Fussler's paper is the establishment of a national pool for comprehensive acquisition of both current serial and monographic resources. The other, of course, is the use of the MARC II data, the NPAC catalog data, and eventually, I would hope, the National Union Catalog data to create a wide variety of telephone directory-like bibliographies that might supplant the card catalog which is already an albatross around my neck, and I suppose around the necks of many of you.

There is a tacit principle underlying both of these recommendations, a principle I think that has been working itself out in the past 25 years. This is, cooperation among research libraries when it comes to planning and funding is all well and good; cooperation when it means sharing the work usually proves to be relatively inefficient, and finally has to yield to centralization. Cooperative cataloging was a perfect case in point. We struggled along with cooperative cataloging for quite a long time, and everyone will admit that this added very greatly to the cataloging information broadly available to the country, but at the same time it was a process that limped along. It was costly, it was wasteful, it was really inefficient, it was exasperating to everyone concerned, until finally the greatly expanded cataloging program at LC took over, and does a much better job today.

What Mr. Fussler is proposing really in this centralized pool for shared access is a centralization of the present cooperative interlibrary loan system, whose defects we really do not need to go into any further. We are all very conscious of them, and I am persuaded that this would be an excellent idea; it would be a much more efficient system. The problem of improving the availability of retrospective collections does not offer any easy or fully satisfactory solution. Mr. Fussler has made some suggestions as to what we might do. I would add a suggestion to that also, and it is, that a great many of us flex our muscles and say we would transfer to this central pool a great deal of the material in our present collections which is relatively little used. This is easily said, but judgment as to just what materials to extract from what collections is exceptionally difficult. The same difficulties are involved in the decision to curtail current acquisitions, because materials are available at a central pool. Even the obvious criteria of infrequency of use is difficult to apply, since very few libraries have use records on which to base such decisions.

However, there are now tremendous pressures toward cost effectiveness at the universities; certainly I feel them. I am being asked more often than I used to be by legislative assistants from the State Capitol, about the number of books that I have that are not being used, and questions such as: How effective actually is your library operating? To what extent are you wasting the State's money? Of course we all duck and bob and weave to point out that this is what makes a great research library, that we have material that nobody ever uses, but we are not going to get away with this explanation very much longer, at least I am pretty sure I am not.

Another difficulty of course is institutional pride in the size of collections. I think this is going to be the easiest one to overcome in times of financial stringency. A third difficulty is faculty attitudes that demand ultra-easy physical access to materials which they think they may need. This leads not only to extremely extensive branch library systems (there are 30 recognized libraries on my campus), but even to the existence of small and acknowledged departmental libraries or library collections of which we have between 40 and 50. I am sure that many large campuses are in the same situation.

This resistance, I think, can be overcome if physical access can be made very rapid. Here we are going to have to depend upon technology. Also, the university administrations must be firm and permit a slightly lower degree of autonomy to the individual departments. There is definitely going to be a need for very rapid transmission between campuses of material in one form or another.

There is also the copyright problem, which is something that we have not touched on today. There is a remote possibility (I hope it is a remote possibility) that our conception of fair use will not be incorporated into the new copyright act, and if by any chance it becomes possible for a copyright owner to forbid reproduction of materials except through a lessee, let us say, to whom all orders must be referred, we will really be in the soup. That is something that we certainly will have to try to prevent from happening. An alternative for that may have to be an adaptation of the services of the National Lending Library at Boston Spa. This could involve the use of multiple subscriptions and sending out copies, which of course will be much slower.

A final problem that arises is the matter of financing. In his paper Mr. Fussler suggests that ARL libraries are spending roughly 33 million dollars a year on serials and on the processing of serials, and that somewhere, somehow, we could manage with just a small part of this money to do a much more efficient job. This would require tithings by libraries or something of the kind to support the central pool. I think this is going to be very difficult to achieve, to persuade people to accept, for the very simple reason that libraries now are so short of funds for a great variety of purposes, that the temptation will be very strong to use any savings that can be effected for other areas of work. Nevertheless, we are doing it now to some extent with the Center for Research Libraries, and I think that many of us would be willing to increase our contribution if we could be assured of success.

There is also the possibility of foundation support, possibly for a building, but certainly not for continued support. User charges are another possibility for financing, but this could contribute only a small part of the cost, unless the charges were too high to be acceptable. There is of course the possibility of Federal financing, for which there seems to be a fairly bleak outlook at the present, but not a hopeless one. We have succeeded in establishing the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging. The Library of Congress does have the MARC program, which I hope they will expand as rapidly as possible; the National Library of Medicine has the MEDLINE program. We do have a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science now, and it is quite likely that we will soon have a White House Conference on Library and Information Services, especially since I understand the new Vice President Gerald Ford seems to be supportive of this idea. Mr. Fussler has suggested in his paper that we might have a government corporation as one possibility for managing such a center, using Federal funding and user charges.

There is another alternative also: we might develop a plan for a national library system; we now have three national libraries, two of which are officially recognized. There is no reason why there can not be another unit in this complex: a national lending library with a shared-access pool if you like, could very well be a part of a national library system. We already have a headstart toward this in the Center for Research Libraries, and it is possible, it seems to me, to get this Center transformed into another part of the national library to provide this lending service.

What are the means through which we can effect this? Well, the National Commission may be helpful. We might work hard on the prospect of getting this White House Conference, if it actually occurs, to come up with some recommendations. The academic community can help, and we do have some friends in Congress. It seems to me there is a possibility of making progress even though this is not the best time in the world to hope for help from the Federal government.

I have confined myself to the nontechnological part, leaving the technological part to Mr. De Gennaro.

MR. DE GENNARO: When Mr. Budington telephoned and asked me to be a discussant with Mr. Wagman on Mr. Fussler's part of the program, I was quite flattered and pleased to accept. I am a little wiser now. I know that Mr. Fussler is a hard act to follow, and that having ten minutes in which to react to a 20 minute talk that I had not heard on a report which took me several hours to read is no easy task. And, if that was not enough, I found myself in total agreement with practically everything he said in that extraordinary document.

So I wondered what I could say in these few minutes that would be of interest to you. Well, I decided that the best thing to do would be to take a few of the major ideas from the Fussler report and meld them with my own thinking and experience and serve you the result.

In the last 20 years we experienced the greatest period of affluence that academic research libraries have ever known. That period came to an end around 1970, and, although the cycle will turn up again, I doubt that any of us will ever experience a similar period of accelerated growth in our libraries. It seems that the normal condition of libraries is austerity; that is the way it was up to the 1950's and that is the way it is again now that the boom is over.

The disturbing thing, however, is that even during that affluent period we continued to talk poor and to be poor because no matter how fast our budgets increased, we increased our commitments and our expectations at an even faster rate.

The reason for this chronic fiscal crisis in libraries is that we have all gotten caught up in a numbers game, where we measure our success and progress by comparing our vital statistics with those of other academic libraries. These statistics have a certain validity, but we all know that they do not really tell us how well we are satisfying the essential needs of our various user groups. In addition, the presence of Harvard and Yale, and a few other exceptional libraries at the top of the list has set an impossible standard and caused an unhealthy competition among us all. Even the leaders are having trouble living up to their traditional images. We all know by now that the goal of self-sufficiency or even comprehensiveness is unrealistic and unattainable. What we have to do is to act on that knowledge and put an end to the numbers and growth game. One of the reasons we have not begun to put an end to it yet is that we have had the hope, or the illusion, that new technology would somehow save us, or at least prolong the game for a few more years.

We thought computers would help us get control of our costs and permit us to cope with increasing workloads, and that microforms would permit us to fill our gaps en bloc at reasonable costs. It is now becoming apparent that the savings from computerization are minimal or even non-existent, and that microtechnology merely creates a whole new class of little-used material which we are pressured to buy from our already inadequate budgets.

The hard reality that we have to face now in 1974, after ten or twelve years of experimentation and development, is that technology is not going to save us. Technology can help us in time and in very significant ways, but we have placed too much faith in it.

We can see that the do-it-yourself era in library automation is coming to an end. We have learned that it is extremely unlikely that systems which are designed locally for operation in a single library will yield any really substantial cost savings, even when they are successful. Local do-it-yourself automation is being superseded by more sophisticated and more promising approaches. Among these are: 1) grant-sponsored development efforts such as Stanford's BALLOTS and Chicago's Library Data Management System, 2) vendor supplied package systems, and 3) the OCLC type regional networks. However, even though these new approaches may be more successful and produce greater savings, we will still be left with a serious fiscal problem because the problem originates in our acquisitions policies and is only exacerbated by our costly processing routines.

Computer technology will have its greatest payoff when used as a tool to assist us in developing and operating new mechanisms for sharing research resources on a national scale. Mr. Fussler's idea of generalizing the monograph bibliographical apparatus into a series of telephone directory-like indexes is the kind of computer application which promises a significant benefit to all research libraries and the scholars who use them. But before we can really be helped much by technology, we must first learn the lesson that the current recession and inflation is beginning to teach us, namely, that no matter how good a case we make for it, the money we will need to continue to build comprehensive research collections in the old image of Harvard and Yale is simply not going to be forthcoming. Our institutions do not have it, and our society cannot or will not provide it.

Furthermore, it is time we seriously questioned the need for building and maintaining the growing number of multimillion volume research collections all across the land. While these collections satisfy the status needs of large numbers of faculty members, they tend to be increasingly inadequate for the real needs of the much smaller number of scholars who actually use them.

The answer to our problems in research libraries, both fiscal and otherwise, is to adopt a more realistic set of goals and scale down our acquisition programs. This will permit us to balance our budgets and generally begin to live within our means again. The effects of these cutbacks can be quite salutary. Processing backlogs can be eliminated, storage areas can be cleared, and library staffs can begin to enjoy the feeling that comes from knowing that they can cope with their workloads.

Such a change in policy would not have been politically feasible before, but current economic trends are forcing that change and we might as well take advantage of it to set our houses in order.

Our most urgent task is to create the national resource libraries which we will need to draw on to supplement our local holdings. I do not know if he meant it that way, but one of the principal messages that I got from Fussler's study is that developing effective means of sharing resources is far more important at this stage and will yield much greater returns than we can expect from the implementation of new technology. All this is not to minimize the eventual benefits of technology, but is rather an attempt to restore our perspective on it. We have been giving technology or local applications of it more attention than is warranted by its benefits to date. It is time we started using this understanding to solve the basic problem, which is effective resource sharing.

I can not conclude without making a general observation on the Fussler report. It is not my role to sing Herman Fussler's praises - others are far more qualified than I - but I have spent considerable time studying the report, and I want to say simply that it is an extraordinary piece of work that Mr. Fussler was uniquely qualified to do. If you read it and absorb its contents, you will have the knowledge to make intelligent judgments not only about new technology, but also about the various other factors and trends that are emerging to shape the future of research libraries.

In one stroke Herman Fussler raises our general level of consciousness and understanding of these matters by an order of magnitude.

* * * *

MR. BUDINGTON: I think we owe a debt of gratitude to Herman Fussler for bringing us a preview of this rather remarkable report, and I also want to thank our scholarly colleagues for their considered examination of this report and bringing us their response to it. Mr. Fussler indicates that the report will be published by the University of Chicago Press sometime in February. I am sure we will all look forward to it with a great deal of anticipation.

* * * *

A COMPOSITE EFFORT TO BUILD AN ON-LINE NATIONAL SERIALS DATA BASE

Lawrence G. Livingston
Council on Library Resources

An urgent requirement exists for a concerted effort to create a comprehensive national serials data base in machine-readable form. Neither the National Serials Data Program nor the MARC Serials Distribution Service, at their current rate of data base building, will solve the problem quickly enough. Because of the absence of a sufficient effort at the national level, several concerted efforts by other groups are under way to construct serials data bases. These institutions have been holding in abeyance the development of their automated serials systems, some for several years, waiting for sufficient development at the national level to provide a base and guidance for the development of their individual and regional systems. This has not been forthcoming, and local pressures from their users, their administrators and their own developing systems are forcing these librarians to act without waiting for the national effort. These efforts are exemplified by the work of one group of librarians, described below.

What has now come to be known as the "Ad Hoc Discussion Group on Serials" had its beginnings in an informal meeting during the American Library Association's Conference in Las Vegas last June. You will also hear this discussion group referred to as the "Toronto Group". This is because its prime mover has been Richard Anable of York University, Toronto, and because the first formal meeting occurred in that city. The expenses of the Toronto and subsequent meetings have been borne by the Council on Library Resources, and Council staff have been involved in each meeting. A fuller exposition of the origins, purposes and plans of the Toronto group has been written by Mr. Anable for the Journal of Library Automation. It appeared in the December 1973 issue.

Quoting from Anable: "At the meeting (in Las Vegas) there was a great deal of concern expressed about:

1. The lack of communication among the generators of machine-readable serials files,
2. The incompatibility of format and/or bibliographic data among existing files,
3. The apparent confusion about the existing and proposed bibliographic description and format "standards".

The Toronto Group agreed that something could and should be done about these problems. If nothing else, better communications among those libraries and systems creating machine-readable files would allow each to enhance its own systems development by taking advantage of what others were doing.

As the discussions progressed, several points of consensus emerged. Among them were:

1. The MARC Serials Distribution Service of the Library of Congress and the National Serials Data Program together were not building a national serials data base in machine-readable form fast enough to satisfy the requirements of developing library systems. This systems development was, in several places, at the point where it could no longer wait on serials data base development at the national level as long as progress remained at the current rate.

2. The MARC serials format developed at LC offered the only hope for machine format compatibility. Every system represented planned to use it. For the purpose of building a composite data base outside LC, the MARC serials format would probably require minor modification, principally by extension. These extensions could and should be added on so as to do no violence to software already developed to handle MARC serials.

3. There existed some difference between the LC MARC serials format and that used by the National Serials Data Program. These differences arose from several circumstances. For example, the MARC serials format predated the International Serials Data System (ISDS), the National Serials Data Program and the key title concept. When these three came along, the requirement existed that the NSDP abide by the conventions of the ISDS. Since the key title is not yet a cataloging title, but is the title to which the International Standard Serial Number is assigned, it is natural that the approach to serial record creation by NSDP should be different from that of a library cataloging serials by conventional methods. A working group under the auspices of the IFLA Cataloging Secretariat has devised an International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials. The working group's recommendations are to be distributed for trial, discussion and recommendation for change in February. When the ISBD(S) is accepted into cataloging practice, some of the differences in MARC usage and NSDP procedure will disappear. Others will still remain and they must be reconciled. We cannot continue with two serial records, both of which claim to be national in purpose but which are incompatible with each other. A good exposition of the differences in these serials records from the point of view of the MARC Development Office is in an article by Mrs. Josephine Pulsifer in the December 1973 issue of the Journal of Library Automation.

4. Major Canadian libraries are active in cooperative work on serials and these two national efforts should be coordinated.

Several other circumstances bear on the problem. For example, the National Serials Data Program is a national commitment of the three national libraries. In addition to the funding from the three national libraries, there are excellent chances that the NSDP will receive funds from other sources to expedite its activities. The NSDP is responsible for the ISSN and key title and for relationships with the International Serials Data System. Ultimately, the ISSN and key title will be of great importance to serials handling in all libraries. For all of these reasons, it is imperative that the activities of the NSDP be channeled into the comprehensive data base building effort described in this paper.

When it was realized at the Council on Library Resources that the Toronto Group was serious and that a data base building effort would result, it was obvious that this had enormous significance for the Library of Congress and other library systems because the result would be a de facto national serials data base. Accordingly, a paper was prepared and sent to LC, urging that an effort be made in Washington to coordinate the efforts of the MARC Serials Distribution Service, the National Serials Data Program and this external effort. To do this, LC was urged to do a brief study of LC serials systems, using LC staff and one person from CLR. LC agreed and the study is now very nearly complete. The written guidance given the study group members was quite specific. They were to study all serials flow at LC and make their recommendations based on what LC should be doing, rather than being constrained by what LC is doing. The overall objectives of the study were to aim for the creation of serials records as near the source as possible and one-time conversion of each record to machine-readable form to serve multiple uses. Specifically to be examined were the serials processing flows of the Copyright Office, the Order Division, the Serial Record Division, New Serials Titles and the National Serials Data Program.

While all of this was going forward, the Toronto Group had some more meetings. OCLC was tentatively selected as the site for the data base building effort. It is understood by everyone that this is a temporary solution; eventually a national-level effort must be mounted which will provide a post-edit capability to bring the composite data base up to nationally acceptable standards. A permanent update capability is also required. This permanent activity, hopefully, will be based at the Library of Congress. OCLC was chosen as the interim site for several reasons, but especially for its proven capability to produce network software and support which will work. Within a very short time OCLC will have on-line serials cataloging and input capability which will extend to some two hundred libraries. No other system is nearly so far advanced.

The Toronto Group has assured itself that the data record OCLC intends to use is adequate and is now working on the conventions required to insure consistency in input and content, to include some recommendations for minor additions to the MARC serials format.

During their deliberations, the Toronto Group realized that, to be effective, their efforts needed formal sponsorship, and discussions to this end were begun. Initially, several agencies were considered to be candidates for this management role. Various considerations quickly narrowed the list down to the Library of Congress, the Association of Research Libraries and the Council on Library Resources, and representatives of these three met to discuss the matter further. During the discussions, CLR was asked to assume the interim management responsibility until a permanent arrangement could be worked out. CLR was selected because, as an operating foundation under the tax laws, it can act expeditiously in matters of this kind. CLR can also deal with all kinds of libraries and has no vested interest in any particular course of action.

Meanwhile, certain institutions in the Toronto Group had indicated that they were ready to pledge $10,000 among themselves for the specific purpose of hiring Mr. Anable as a consultant to continue his coordinating activities. The group asked CLR to act as agent to collect and disburse these funds.

CLR is ready to assume the initial responsibility for the management of this cooperative data base building effort, if that is the will of the leadership in the library community. CLR is prepared to commit one staff member full time to the project who is well versed in the machine handling of MARC serials records. This is Mr. George Parsons, and other staff members will assist as appropriate. Mr. Anable has agreed to act as a consultant to help coordinate these activities. CLR would aim for the most complete, accurate and consistent serial record in the LC MARC serials format which can be had under the circumstances. During the effort, CLR will act as the point of contact between OCLC and the participating libraries, assisting in negotiating contracts and other agreements as required. The composite data base will be made available to all other libraries as the least possible cost for copying. Initially at least, the costs of this effort will have to be shared by the participating libraries, since no additional funds are presently available. The goal is to build 100,000 serial records the first year, another 100,000 the second year, and design and implement the permanent mechanism the third year, while file-building continues.

As the project gets under way, it will work like this: a set of detailed written guidelines for establishing the record and creating the input will be promulgated, and agreement to abide by them will be a prerequisite to participation. Selected libraries with known excellence in serial records will be asked to participate; others may request participation. Those selected who already have or can arrange for terminals on the OCLC system will participate on-line. This is the preferred method, but it may be possible to permit record creation off-line, such records to be added to the data base in a batch mode. It is very difficult to merge serial files from different sources in this way, so an attempt will be made to find a large serials data base in machine-readable form for use as a starting point. This file would be read into the OCLC system. A participating library wishing to enter a record would first search to see whether it existed in the initial data base. If a record is found, it would be updated insofar as this is possible, within the standards chosen for the system. It may be further updated by other participants, still within the system standards, but at some point update on a record in the system will reach a point of diminishing returns and the record will remain static until a post-edit at the national level can be performed. These records will be for use as their recipients see fit, but their prime purpose is to support the development of automated serials systems while eliminating duplication of effort.

Details of how to flag these records in the OCLC data base as they are being created by this effort will be worked out, as will be the relationship between this effort and the rest of OCLC activities. CLR will, from time to time, report progress to the community.

It would be the hope of CLR that the Toronto Group will continue to assist in the technical and detailed aspects of the project. In addition, and after consultation with the appropriate people, an advisory group will be appointed to advise CLR in this effort.

* * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

Election of New Board Members

MR. BUDINGTON: The first item of business in our afternoon session is the election of the new Board members. We have four members who are departing from the Board. They are: David Weber, Arthur Hamlin, Ben Bowman and our long distance runner, John McDonald. We certainly want to express the thanks of the membership to these good men for their service to the Association. I will call on the Chairman of the Nominating Committee, Ralph Hopp to formally present the candidates in nomination.

MR. HOPP: One of the responsibilities of the Vice President is to draft a slate of nominees for the Board. To assist me in this, I had a committee consisting of Lucien White and Russell Shank.

The candidates for election to a three-year term on the Board are: William Dix, Princeton University; Gustave Harrer, University of Florida; David Heron, University of Kansas; Carl Jackson, Indiana University; and John McGowan, Northwestern University.

MR. BUDINGTON: The provisions of the ARL Bylaws specify that each member may vote only once. Each member may vote for three nominees. The three with the highest number of votes are declared the new members of the Board for three year terms.

> [Tellers selected for the election were Richard Talbot and Edward Lathem. After a short interval Mr. Budington announced the results of the election].

MR. BUDINGTON: Elected for three-year terms on the Board are William Dix, Gustave Harrer and David Heron.

* * * *

ARL/SCONUL Meeting

MR. BUDINGTON: As you know, the International Federation of Library Associations will be meeting in Washington, Saturday, November 16 to Friday, November 23, 1974. We have received a letter from Anthony Loveday who is Secretary of SCONUL, the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries, ARL's British counterpart. To quote from his letter: "This Committee recently considered a proposition forwarded by Mr. R.J. Bates, our former Honorary Secretary and Vice Chairman, that SCONUL look into the possibility of a joint ARL SCONUL meeting to be held in Washington this year, immediately following the forthcoming IFLA meeting." It would appear that there might be some 14 or so SCONUL representatives attending the IFLA sessions, and so it could provide a useful opportunity for such a joint meeting. Mr. Loveday suggests a three day meeting (this could be varied of course) following the IFLA meeting. The Board gave some consideration to this at its meeting yesterday. We have had pleasant relationships and some joint meetings with SCONUL in times past on their home grounds. We have not inquired of SCONUL as to what their particular interests might be in a program. It seemed that it might be useful to bring this to your attention this afternoon to see how many of the members assembled here would have an interest in attending the proposed joint meeting with our British colleagues for a day or two after the IFLA meeting. I remind you that the dates for the IFLA meeting go through November 23, so this meeting could be scheduled November 24 and 25. [At this point Mr. Budington asked for a show of hands of those who would be interested in participating in a joint ARL/SCONUL meeting. Approximately 35 indicated interest].

MR. MCDONALD: I was not one of those who participated in times past in SCONUL/ARL activities, but I was one of those spoken to about this possibility, and it did seem to me that perhaps we had an opportunity to reciprocate for the good hospitality of the British years ago. I think it should be said that the ARL Office is already fully involved with the arrangements for the IFLA Conference itself, and if the Association decides that it would like to try to arrange the conference that has been proposed by SCONUL, it ought to recognize that it would have to do so through a committee or some other group that would shoulder the responsibility of putting the program together and making the arrangements. I think it would not be proper to expect members of the ARL Office staff to take on this additional responsibility. I would like it understood that I do not make this last comment in any effort to oppose the notion of the get-together; quite the contrary, I think we should do it, and I hope we can do it.

MR. BUDINGTON: I think we saw evidence in the show of hands that a number of members may be willing to assist in planning the meeting.

MR. ROVELSTAD: Could we plan to have the ARL Membership meeting following the IFLA meeting? This would mean scheduling our meeting in November 1974 instead of January 1975.

MR. MCCARTHY: I would like to get some indication of the membership's reaction to that. Who would favor the Board's consideration of moving the January 1975 meeting to November 1974? [By a show of hands approximately 40 members indicated they were in favor of this]. The vote is close. Are there any other suggestions or comments from the members that might guide the Board?

MR. ROGERS: Some of us have been talking about the wisdom or lack of wisdom of our continuing to follow the ARL schedule at midwinter, which obligates us to continue to come to Chicago in January for at least the next four years. Among other things, I think the spacing of the meetings as they now fall is not ideal, and I wonder if the Board has given any consideration to the possibility of cutting ourselves completely adrift [from ALA] and setting our own meeting schedule independently, and hopefully in pleasanter places.

MR. BUDINGTON: The Board has given some additional consideration to varying our meeting schedule, not only to a more pleasant climate in midwinter, but the possibility that the Spring session may indeed be causing some conflicts in institutions which have varied their academic schedules. So we have begun to think about shifting not only the Spring meeting, but conceivably the Winter meeting also. I know that the Officers and the Office staff would welcome any expressions of feeling on preferred dates for either of these times of year.

* * * *

Report of the Membership Committee

The next order of business deals with a report of the Membership Committee. As you will recall, this comes up because of a request made when our present membership criteria were established some two years ago. It was indicated then that in two years we should look at these criteria to see what effect they have had and what problems they may be causing. Last Spring a new Membership Committee was appointed including Ben Bowman, James Jones, Richard O'Keeffe, Ellsworth Mason and Howard Rovelstad as chairman. They have worked hard and diligently, and I would now call on Howard Rovelstad to make his report and present the recommendations, which will be discussed and voted on individually. [The full Report of the Membership Committee is shown in Appendix A.]

MR. ROVELSTAD: I will not review the background for the report, but will proceed directly to the vote on the recommendations. I shall first read the recommendation, move its adoption, and then present additional information which has come to us since our Committee met.

Recommendation 1:

> Charter members and other long-term members will be given special consideration in meeting maintenance of membership requirements: As these members were admitted under different requirements, and as certainly in most cases they have actively participated in ARL, and, it is

> believed, as ARL has proved its worth to these libraries, they should normally be authorized to continue their memberships if they wish to do so.

On behalf of the Membership Committee I move the adoption of this recommendation which really is in two parts: first, there is the principle that is involved here, and secondly, the implementation of that principle. It seems to me that our explanation which was sent to you earlier and is available to you here, is perhaps sufficiently clear. Either you believe in it or you do not believe in it.

I think that we might say a word about the implementation. You notice that this is a suggestion as a means of implementing this procedure. We indicate that the Committee would suggest that these members explain to the ARL Board their situations, future plans of the institutions they represent, advantages of their membership to the institutions they represent, and to ARL. I think that the Committee feels the Board could determine its own procedures as to how this would be handled. Ben Bowman in his letter to me, indicated that he felt these institutions should not report to the Board but to the Membership Committee first. The Membership Committee could then make recommendations to the Board as to the status. Also in this recommendation, we are taking a middle-of-the-road approach. We are not indicating that membership will just automatically continue, but that there will be a kind of accounting to the officers of the Association when members do not meet the criteria. I think we feel that we would like to have at least some teeth in this particular requirement for membership, even though they are not quite as sharp as those now prescribed.

MR. GRIBBIN: My library is one of those that did not meet all the criteria for maintenance of membership. However, when I brought to the attention of my university administration the possibility that we would be disqualified from ARL membership, I found that I had a very effective argument for obtaining increased library support. So the strict application of quantitative criteria can have local benefits. If on the other hand, my university administration had known that the quantitative criteria could possibly have been set aside, the argument in favor of increased library support could have lost its impact. I am not arguing against the recommendation. I am not at all sure that Tulane University would qualify as a long-term member, since we have been a member only six years. Incidentally, I think that "long-term member" should be defined. I do suggest that any circumvention of this application of quantitative criteria be made very difficult. It is suggested here that it would be made very difficult, and I am supporting that suggestion. I was on the earlier membership committee, and we were pleased to have strictly quantitative criteria adopted. If these quantitative criteria are now to be watered down, I think it should be only to a very small degree, and that only the most unusual cirsumstances should be taken into consideration.

MR. BUDINGTON: Is there any further discussion on the recommendation regarding the institutions which fail to meet criteria as established in our membership regulations? If there is no further discussion, I shall call for a vote. [A vote was taken. The recommendation was approved].

MR. ROVELSTAD: Recommendation 2:

Libraries will be asked to report volumes in hardcopy and, in addition, one of the following: (a) actual volume count in the four categories of microfilm reels, microcards, microprint sheets, microfiches, and ultramicrofiches or (b) volume count based on these equivalents -

1 microfilm reel = 1 volume equivalent
8 microcards or microfiches = 1 volume equivalent
4 microprints = 1 volume equivalent
1 ultramicrofiche = 1 volume equivalent

Volume and volume equivalents will be totalled to form the critical resource statistics to be used in studying membership requirements.

On behalf of the Committee, I move the adoption of this recommendation. Here too, I think that we have a two-part consideration. One is the principle involved, the other is the formula which is being suggested here. Again the principle is something you either believe in or you do not.

The conversion equivalents are something that we could talk about for a long time. The Committee did some research. It did not make a study on its own, but it did some searching about to find out what some other organizations had done in this respect. A budget formula for six state-supported four-year colleges in the State of Washington used the same formula. Colorado has used this formula. Their formula, as a matter of fact, is exactly the same as the one we have proposed to you. Several libraries at the University of California have agreed informally to represent one reel of microfilm as equal to a volume, and three microforms as equal to one volume. The Maryland Council for Higher Education has done some testing, and we have been experimenting with one reel of microfilm as equal to one volume and eight microforms as equal to one volume. The presentation we are making here is probably the most conservative that one could make on this issue.

Douglas Bryant wrote to Mr. McCarthy when he received the report of the Committee. He recommends the continuation of the collection of statistics for hardcopies in our libraries. Publication of the volume count augmented to include the new microform figures would certainly be all right, and of course the Committee did intend that the collection of the physical hardcopy volume count would be continued.

MR. WHITE: Is there any thought that if this recommendation were adopted, it might affect the method of reporting for the annual statistics of ARL?

MR. ROVELSTAD: I am not quite sure what you mean as far as method is concerned. I would presume the same method would be used, and we do provide most of this information now without converting or using volume equivalencies.

MR. WHITE: For ARL statistics we are counting physical units. Each microcard, for example, is reported as a unit, and not as a volume equivalent. My question was, if this recommendation were adopted, might it now involve a change in the way these things are reported in the statistics?

MR. ROVELSTAD: I think the library would here have the choice. If it had the actual volume count of material that it has in microform, these statistics would be reported; otherwise it would be necessary to report the equivalencies. The hardcopy volume count would be continued, and the equivalencies would also be indicated, so that you would finally end up with a total number of units of material available.

MR. MCCARTHY: I have not worked it out but as I would see it, I believe that we would continue to get the count on the individual types of microforms, and there would be, I judge, an added column which would give the converted volume equivalent.

SPEAKER: Why not continue to report these as you have done in the ARL figures, with the hardcopy books and the microtext listed separately, and let the Committee translate these into hardcopy volumes for the purpose of establishing whether or not the institution meets the criteria? I think it is misleading if you report hardcopy books and microtext separately, and then the composite of what you get when you translate microforms into volume equivalents. Let the person looking at the figures do the translating if he wants to. I think a scholar wanting to choose a library in which to do research would certainly choose one with five million volumes before he would my institution, if we had two million volumes and three million volumes in microtext. I do not think it would disqualify anybody. The institutions with the assistance of the Committee would qualify just as readily if you did the translating.

MR. ROVELSTAD: I do not think it is really in conflict, except that we would, I think, like to give the library a choice of how these are to be reported. That is, if the library itself knows exactly how many volumes it has represented on microcards, that figure could be used rather than the formula of equivalents, which I recommended here. This could still be overcome then; I do not see it as an insoluble problem.

MR. DAGNESE: I would like to speak against this motion, because it seems to me that what it is doing is to further encourage something that Hugh Atkinson was talking about this morning, and that is the numbers game. To convert these things and consider them equivalent volumes only, keeps us in the ballgame of dealing with print material, and I do not believe that it is required for us to do this to maintain our integrity. Secondly, it would mean that each one of us would be going to a conversion figure, because we at Purdue only count the physical pieces that come in. We do not divide them by volumes. As Benjamin Powell said, if anybody needs to look at this or the Committee wants to examine it, they can certainly do so. I would also like to ask the Committee whether in considering microforms which are already reported, they were willing to undertake the consideration of other audio visual material as being reportable items of interest to ARL statistics, such as slides, tapes, films and so forth. Many of us hold a great number of these in our collections. They certainly augment our collections for the research scholar.

MR. ROVELSTAD: I do not think the Committee is in any position to work on all of this. We worked on a very large bulk of material that has an obvious relationship to a physical volume.

MR. BOSS: I am encouraged to see that microforms are finally being recognized as consequential resources in a library. I am happy to see them counted, although I am not sure that we really need a volume equivalent of the type that is being proposed. What seems to be a much more consequential issue however, is whether or not these equivalent volumes that are being proposed to be counted, are in fact as accessible as the volumes with which they are being equated. It makes more sense to me to count the number of cataloged and classified volumes that are readily accessible to patrons, than it does to count things in various formats. In other words, a microform that is not accessible because it has not been cataloged or classified or otherwise organized for use, is of considerably lesser value. I realize I am opening up Pandora's box, but I think volumes organized by classification, and cataloged in such a way as to make them truly accessible to the scholar, regardless of the physical format they happen to be in, ought to be in the criteria.

MR. BUDINGTON: Any further discussion? I will propose then that we vote on the Committee's recommendation which involves really the collection of statistics and our present practices. In order to calculate a final volume statistic, we would convert any reported microforms to volume equivalents. This I think is the meaning of the recommendation.

MR. DIX: Do I understand that if we vote in favor of this motion, we will cease to collect concrete statistics on microforms? If I understand, the library may choose to report a volume count based on these equivalents, and if so, we would lose the statistic that I think you said Douglas Bryant wanted to maintain, which I would also like to see maintained somewhere for historical study; the amount of microform material which we have. May I have an interpretation on it?

MR. ROVELSTAD: I see no reason why this count could not be collected as it is collected now, plus either the actual volume count in microforms or else an equivalent count, so that you would have the number of microforms in a library as well as the volume count. I think that would be no problem.

MR. BUDINGTON: Then we would continue to report both types of statistics, and we would have the option of converting to the total.

MS. WHITNEY: I would like to make a substitute motion that this recommendation be referred to the Board of Directors for further study and presentation to the membership. [A vote was taken on the substitute motion which was approved].

MR. ROVELSTAD: Recommendation 3:

> Item 6 on the 1972-1973 questionnaire, "Number of current periodicals," will read on future questionnaires: "Number of current serials including current periodicals."

I think there is nothing more to say, unless you want to get into the subject of a good definition for a serial or a periodical. The Committee feels that it does make considerably more sense however, to indicate that you are collecting a statistic on the number of current serials, including periodicals, then to say that you are collecting statistics on periodicals, and then include serials.

MR. SPARKS: I have a question here. Will we be in danger of double counting in the case of monographs and serials?

MR. ROVELSTAD: This item concerns current subscriptions rather than holdings in volume counts, so that there would not be that kind of overlap. I would assume that we would continue to use the UNESCO definition, as we did in our statistical counting for these last few years.

VOICE: How does this compare with the Office of Education definition of a periodical? This is intended to be the same, is it not? If it is the same, then could not that reference be made?

MR. ROVELSTAD: I see no reason why it could not be used, and I think that it is very important that we try to go along with the Office of Education in gathering these statistics. Frank Schick from the Office of Education met with the Committee and was anxious to get information from us. We did talk about definitions and so forth, and perhaps some day we will be much clearer about definitions and statistical data as a result of such conversations.

MR. BUDINGTON: Is there further discussion on the recommendation in question? I will ask for a vote then. [A vote was taken on the recommendation which was adopted].

MR. ROVELSTAD: Recommendation 4:

> The statistic regarding the number of Ph.D's awarded should continue to be collected, but this category should not be included in the membership requirements.

There has been considerable discussion about this recommendation, probably more than any other. Ellsworth Mason, a member of our Committee, wrote to me shortly after he received the final draft of this presentation. He said, "So far as I am concerned, there is no figure more relevant to appraising the research commitment of a university, than the number of Ph.D's awarded, both in the number of fields in which the degree is offered, and in the number of doctorates produced each year". This is something you may want to discuss.

MR. BUDINGTON: I would affirm Howard Rovelstad's statement that this is the one item that comes up for most discussion in consideration of new candidates, as well as those amongst us who are striving to meet the criteria.

MR. MCDONALD: I think that the difficulty may be that too few institutions seem to be able to meet the criterion as it is now established. This is simply a fault of the percentage of the median that we are using. I would argue that rather than drop the whole requirement, we might consider lowering that percentage so as to make the barrier less formidable.

MR. BOSS: I would like to agree with that. In our particular state we are formula-funded, and one of the basic arguments for determining whether an institution is a comprehensive graduate institution stressing research, or an aspiring institution with a limited number of Ph.D programs that should be funded on some other basis, revolves around this very factor.

We have been able to cite the ARL criteria as one element for establishing what really makes a graduate comprehensive research-oriented institution, and while it is true that the present way of determining this is a tricky one, because a few very large institutions tend to skew the average figure or the median figure, to give the whole thing up would be most unfortunate, I think. Perhaps what can be done is for a committee to formulate a minimal level to be voted upon by the membership as to what is perceived to be an appropriate minimum standard that makes adjustments for that handful of very, very large institutions with a large number of programs and a very high productivity of Ph.D's.

MR. BUDINGTON: I would just remind us that this does not relate to the number of Ph.D programs, but to the gross number of degrees which are granted. Is there further discussion to the recommendation as made? If not, we will take a vote on it. The recommendation is, that the statistic regarding the number of Ph.D degrees awarded continue to be collected, but that this category not be included in the membership requirement. [A vote was taken on the recommendation. The recommendation was rejected].

MR. ROVELSTAD: Recommendation 5:

> The pertinent bylaw regarding non-university library membership in ARL continued to be followed: Invitations to other libraries shall be issued at the initiative of the Board of Directors after approval of the membership.

As we have indicated here, Recommendation 5 seems not to call for any action this afternoon. The Committee wanted to report to you how it responded to one of its main assignments. For the discussion perhaps you will want to ask the Committee to study further this difficult area in which we tried to include in membership, libraries that are not associated with academic institutions. I believe that brief explanation that we give in our report sets the background for this. We would be glad to answer any questions, and I would hope there would be some discussion on this subject.

MR. BUDINGTON: As noted in the document, it does not necessarily call for action, but we would welcome discussion of this problem. I have a curious interest in it myself. Do you have any opinions on it? If there is no discussion, we will conclude this element of the program with our thanks to the Membership Committee. I think we have come to some conclusions in some cases, but obviously some of the problems are still with us.

* * * *

Report of the Committee on Machine-Based Serials Records

MR. BUDINGTON: Several reports from committees did come in from the Board for consideration at this meeting. One was the report of the Committee on Data Bases from Gustave Harrer, Chairman. We will not this afternoon present this report, but it will appear in the published Minutes for your information. [The Committee report is included as Appendix B of these Minutes.]

The second item here is a report from the Committee on Machine-Based Serials Records. This report will discuss the questionnaire which was distributed to each of your institutions in the not-too-distant past. We feel that there is considerable interest in the outcome of the survey, which is fairly significant. I would like to ask the Committee Chairman, John McGowan, to give us a very brief summary of the results. [The full report of this Committee appears as Appendix C of these Minutes.]

MR. MCGOWAN: As you recall, last year there were a few members of the Association that were quite interested in the activity involving machine-readable serials data bases. A committee was formed made up of William Budington, Ralph Hopp, Warren Boes and Norman Stevens of the University of Connecticut. The Board charged the Committee to review the present or anticipated systems of machine-based serials data, and to make recommendations based upon the results of the review to the ARL membership. The Committee met several times. One of the things we were really trying to do was to see if any of the ARL libraries might serve as a serials data base model, in the sense that it would be MARC compatible in every way. We designed a questionnaire with that in mind.

The questionnaire went out to all ARL libraries; we got a 100% response to it. I will now quickly pick out highlights from the report of the survey. I think the first thing is that of the 86 libraries that participated in the survey, 64 had machine-readable files; there were 22 that did not have files; there was one that was thinking about creating such a file. One of the significant things about this is that in those 64 libraries, there were 1,723,586 serial records that had been converted to machine-readable form. If one can use the figure of a dollar a record, the total cost of making that conversion in the ARL libraries could be somewhere in the order of two million dollars.

Most of the libraries reported on the coverage of the files. There were very few libraries that had detailed holdings (bound and unbound issues and gaps) in machine-readable files. *One of the significant things* was that most of the machine-readable files were used for union list purposes. Twenty-three libraries reported that their serials file was part of a union list. These union lists include the holdings of 940 libraries, of which 500 were college and university, 204 public, 203 special, and miscellaneous about 33, so in many cases [illegible] union lists were probably part of statewide systems, but they reflected a large number of libraries, not just the ARL libraries.

One of the other things that was significant was that most of the machine-readable files were not used for internal processing. There are only a few libraries that use the files for ordering, checking and binding control; in this category they primarily use it for financial accounting and ordering. This would lead one to say that the system had only six libraries that had on-line access to their files.

Regarding the kind of hardware used, there were 57 installations with I.B.M. equipment, and the rest were scattered among other companies, so one might assume that if a system were to be developed, concern with hardware should not be overlooked.

We also were looking at whether there were libraries whose records were compatible with MARC. The 66 libraries responding to this question indicated they were in some degree MARC compatible. While I do not want to get into this in detail, the number of fields affected the degree of compatibility. It turned out that only four libraries claimed they were fully MARC compatible. There were very few libraries that used all the fields. One could again argue that maybe most libraries do not need a fully MARC compatible file because of expense, and because of the fact that probably there is not an operational need for it. I think if one were to attempt to form a conclusion or judgement from this, it would be that libraries now are facing substantially larger costs for making changes than were involved in the original conversion. If one assumes that the original conversion cost might have been $1.00 a record a few years ago, it might be $2.00 or $3.00 a record now, so the full conversion cost for the membership would be somewhere in the order of two or three million dollars, depending upon the degree of MARC compatibility.

The conclusion one comes to here is that somehow we have to come up with a centralized cooperative effort for conversion, and I hope that there will be this trend. I would recommend strongly that the member libraries encourage any activity of that sort because I think the outlay of dollars for conversion will be substantial if the effort is made to bring files into line with the MARC serials data base.

* * * *

Interlibrary Loan

MR. BUDINGTON: Our next item relates to an area of particular interest and concern to research libraries--the area of interlibrary loans. The Association has been deeply involved in studies, beginning several years ago with the Westat study of costs of interlibrary loans under the guidance of Arthur McAnally.

During the past year the Association has sponsored three very substantial continuation studies relating to interlibrary loans. These studies have now been completed with the exception of a few minor revisions in the documents. When revised these documents will be issued to the membership, and you will have copies this Spring of the reports of the three studies. I might remind you what these were: 1) a study funded by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science entitled "Feasibility Study of Centralized and Regionalized Interlibrary Loan Centers" with Rolland Stevens as the principal investigator; 2) a study funded by the National Science Foundation and carried out by Westat concerned with the feasibility of an improved interlibrary loan system for academic libraries through the determination of an equitable borrowing fee system and the development of a national periodical resources center; and 3) a feasibility study of an electronic distributive network as a means of facilitating communication with respect to interlibrary loans. The subcontractor for this last project was Becker and Hayes, Inc.

Since all of these studies were coming to an end, and since all of them were in the area of concern of the ARL Commission on Access, of which Edward Lathem has been Chairman, the Commission was quite concerned about the findings and recommendations, and of course, the question, Where do we go from here? And so a meeting was convened on January 17, 1974 at the Palmer House, attended by the contractors and the ARL advisory committees for these studies. A full day was spent in going over the studies themselves and the results. It was felt that the conclusions should be reported to you in some detail. One of the presiding officers at the meeting was Rutherford Rogers. I will call on him now to provide us with a summary of those proceedings.

MR. ROGERS: You have done such an excellent job of setting the scene, that I think all I need to do is give you the conclusions that we came to on January 17.

The group concluded that ARL should officially take the position that interlibrary lending involves costs to net lending libraries to the disadvantage of their primary clientele and that therefore it is appropriate that libraries be recompensed for such loans by fees charged to the borrowing institution until such time as special subsidies from public agencies are available.

The group recognized that a library might be foreclosed (e.g., within a state system) from charging fees or might choose not to charge for other reasons. However, to the extent that fees are levied within a national system they should be uniform despite the obvious fact that costs vary from library to library. Such fees should be charged only for filled requests, but the charges should be set in such a way that the burden of performing bibliographic work on unfilled requests is taken into account. Furthermore, fees should be set initially at 50% of full direct costs, including overhead, with increases in the fee structure to be instituted gradually over five years to reflect full cost recovery.

It was concluded that a coupon system, probably operated under ARL, offered the simplest, most effective way for paying fees in the near-term but that the Association should move to the second phase of the SILC investigation, if it can be funded, because of the potential advantages that the SILC system appears to offer.

Four variations of a National Periodical Resources System were considered:

1. A single national center.
2. A national center with satellite centers specifically established to handle intensively used serials.
3. A regional system built on existing large libraries.
4. A more elaborate system built on existing libraries with regional bibliographic center services added.

The group is recommending to the ARL Board that the initial effort should be directed to the establishment of a single national center, it being understood that if this is successful and subsequent operation indicates the desirability of supplementary regional centers they be added when funding is available.

MR. BUDINGTON: We could get into a considerable discussion of course on the pros and cons of the findings of these studies. I would like to indicate to you the events that have occurred since this review meeting on Thursday. The outcome of the deliberations as just reported to you by Mr. Rogers, was reported formally to the ARL Board of Directors at its meeting yesterday, together with a recommendation. The Board received this report with interest and with thanks. At the recommendation of the Access Commission, a standing Committee on Interlibrary Loans was established. The Board referred the report of the Commission to that Committee for further refinement and formulation of detailed recommendations which are to be brought to the Board at its meeting in Toronto. A report will be made to the membership at that time.

Furthermore, in response to the Commission's recommendation, the Board established a Task Force to investigate a national periodical resource plan. The principal responsibility of this Task Force is to wait in the wings, if you will, to consider the present study being made for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. That study deals more specifically with details of regional and bibliographic resource centers. At such time as that report is completed and released, the Task Force will deal with it and also bring its recommendations to the Board of Directors. Some of these matters will be receiving further attention this Spring, and the outcome of these deliberations and the actions taken by the Board will be brought to your attention, possibly for action in Toronto.

I would like to remind you that there is a great deal of detail underlying the Committee reports, and a full day of conversation and discussion underlay the very brief report which Mr. Rogers gave us. I assure you that the Board is deeply concerned and will be working with the Committee on these problems.

* * * *

ARL Mission and Objectives

The next item for consideration is the Statement on ARL Mission and Objectives. [Appendix D is the statment referred to here]. I would remind the membership that this has been under consideration for over a year. This consideration came about as a result of several occurences. Our previous formal statement of goals was put down in 1961. Although this earlier statement is still quite valid in some respects, in 1972 we became aware of the probable need to re-examine those goals, particularly in order to enable us to respond more effectively to national planning requirements.

This need for re-examination was emphasized by the paper by Neal Harlow[1] which came to us two or three years ago, which was also the outcome of one of the Federal Information Resources Conferences. A committee under Carl Jackson dealt with recommendations from that Conference. These were specifically that the Association attempt to redefine the goals and objectives of research libraries. As we began to come to grips with that major assignment, it was determined that we would do well to decide what the objectives of our own Association might be.

So there was established a little over a year ago, a Committee on Role and Objectives of the Association, consisting of the officers, the

---

[1] Harlow, Neal. The Long-term Objectives of Research Libraries in Respect to Federal Legislation. (Prepared for the ARL Federal Relations Committee). Revised, April 1971.

Commission Chairmen, the Chairman of the Federal Information Resources Conference Committee and the Federal Relations Committee. The Committee on Role and Objectives had two very substantive meetings during the winter. A draft of the Statement of Role and Objectives was discussed at our meeting in New Orleans in May 1973. At the Business Meeting in New Orleans substantial discussion took place on some of the larger and smaller elements of that Statement. The membership at that point had its full opportunity for discussion. The Committee then revised the Statement in the light of that discussion. The Statement came to the Board at its Fall meeting, and it is now brought to you with the Board's recommendation that it be adopted as the official Statement of ARL Mission and Objectives.

The chair would entertain a motion at this point, that the statement as presented be approved. [The motion was made and seconded from the floor. A vote was then taken. The Statement was approved]. The Statement is now our official document.

* * * *

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

MR. BUDINGTON: The next item on the agenda will be a report from Charles Stevens on the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

MR. STEVENS: I am very appreciative of the opportunity to once again come before you to talk with you briefly about the work of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Those of you who were at the May meeting last year will remember that I had this opportunity and told you then about what I felt had been the accomplishments during the time ending at that meeting. I come before you now to bring you highlights of what has transpired since the May meeting. I am not attempting in the few minutes alloted to me, to tell you all about what has happened at all of the meetings of the National Commission, or about what has transpired outside of those meetings, but rather to whet your appetite for some of the material that is available, and to encourage you to ask questions of the Commission and to contribute to its continuing work.

The second annual report of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science will appear in about two weeks, and I hope that when that report appears on your desk, you will find time to read it. I certainly will endeavor to send it to every member of the Association, and to anyone else in this room who asks that it be sent to him or to her. It will go to the members automatically. When you read that report, we hope that you will be able to comment quite significantly on what happened during the second year of our work, and to extend your thoughts to what has happened since that time, because the report covers the fiscal year and quite a good deal has happened since June. It is what has happened since June that I want to discuss with you.

Let me just review where we were last May when I was able to tell you that the Commission had achieved certain program directives. We knew that we were going to work toward planning information as a national resource, we were going to think largely about the user rather than about a particular type of library or a particular characteristic of an information system. We thought we might do something about equalizing the citizen access to knowledge resources, and that if we worked toward these goals we would create a national information system, and we would find formulas for re-enforcing library services at all levels, and that in so doing, would promote the kinds of systems and services that were of common concern. We have not had a great deal to do with the promotion of the National Serials Data Base, but it is that kind of thing that we are interested in working with. This morning we heard something about technology, and here too the Commission felt its role would find application in the integration of technology with information services. Finally we are interested in the economies of scale which would come about through planning efforts.

At the New York meeting that followed hard upon the heels of the ARL meeting, the Commission made a commitment to give 100% of its energies and funds at that time to development of a national planning document. That document has been referred to as a white paper of the Commission or the "National Program Document." It will be reprinted soon in Library Journal and it will also appear in Special Libraries. It has appeared already in a number of local library publications. Copies are available from the Commission office, we hope that if you have not seen this early draft document, that you will take the time to study it.

I would like to cover for you some of the points that are in it, and that were unveiled immediately in advance of the third hearing that was held in Boston, Massachusetts to which some of you contributed. That document focuses on six areas of attention. The first, that there should be created within the Federal government, a national authority as a focal point for policy and planning. Our charge is to provide advice to the President and to the Congress. We felt that there should be a body with broader authority, a permanent agency to work on the areas of implementation. Where to locate such a body within the Federal government was something we were not ready to deal with in that early draft document. We felt the body might find its place in an existing agency, such as the Office of Education, the Library of Congress, the National Commission itself, or somewhere else. We did feel that it should be concerned with all the operational aspects of libraries and information systems, be concerned with standards, with formats, with stimulating interstate and intrastate cooperation, and that, underlining and really encompassing all of the other recommendations, such an agency was preeminent in what would follow.

The second point in the draft document covers national collections. What we heard today in the morning discussion about the importance of collections and the organizing of collections leads directly towards what the Commission felt would need to happen at a national level, with a designation of collections of unique significance among research libraries, special libraries, public libraries of significance, not necessarily members of ARL, of large non-library information sources, those holding data bases of significance, abstracting and indexing services, and even some commerical files. These would all be part of a national collection that would receive Federal funding for their participation as parts of that national collection. Because of the proposed Federal funding, these collections would be expected to extend services to the public in general under conditions that they might establish.

The third component of the national program deals with national services of common interest to the information community and to the users of that community. Here it would be necessary under the program document, to identify and designate, or even create, national bibliographic and reference services, and then support those services in a cost effective manner. Standardized cataloging such as that available through MARC, procedures for interlibrary loan, the development of a periodical bank and of a national document service would all be encompassed within this area of common national services.

The fourth area within the program draft document, and I keep underlining that word "draft," because we think of it as the first draft of maybe several drafts in this area, deals with the areas of networks and technology. This is the area in the draft document that seems to have attracted the most attention, because it does deal with technology and gives the Commission a kind of bad name as being interested only in technology. The network portion of the draft document specifically points out the areas of communications and computers as those areas to receive prime attention in the early days of thinking about what the Commission can do. The Federal Telecommunications System, which is a leased service within the commerical sector of communication, is thought of as being that service that can most quickly be brought to the aid of all kinds of libraries as they try to develop the kinds of cooperatives that are necessary in a national program. The type of computer services that can be harnessed to assist a communications program will also become the concern of the Commission and would become components of that sort of national program in development.

The fifth area within the proposed program, deals with a number of extra considerations, many of them in the manpower area. The development and measurement of the manpower situation as it stands, and the selection, education, training and re-education of persons within the information community is a concern. The whole area of studying user needs and evaluation of those needs, desires and demands, and the problem of creating and maintaining a level of publicity that brings information to the attention of those who have been funded as well as those who can use it, fits within the extramural concerns. Finally, the research and development not associated with what could loosely be called network also fits within these extra considerations.

Sixth and last in that draft document, and perhaps most important, the document talks about the interfacing of those first five considerations, that is, trying to figure out if it can, how the national network can grow out of what has already happened. It would be unfortunate if anyone reading the draft document felt that we thought within the Commission that what had taken place already was simply baby steps, and that all would have to be rebuilt based on what the Commission thought. We know, and it is carefully exposed in that draft document, (perhaps not carefully enough said for all,) that what has happened on a local, on a state and on a regional basis formed the building blocks for what the Commission can do in the future. Perhaps using those building blocks the Commission can find ways to create a standard for local development, a standard for state and regional development, that can become accepted widely, funded nationally as well as on a regional and statewide basis, and thereby achieve the objectives toward which the whole program is directed--that is of satisfying the ultimate user.

The program document unveiled in October has been discussed with the members of the Association of Research Libraries, with members of the American Library Association, Special Libraries Association, American Society for Information Science, Council of National Library Associations and a number of others. We felt it was desirable that the draft document see the light of day at a very early stage. We could take no pride of authorship in it; the ideas mainly came from earlier documents. As one looks at what has happened since October it is clear that that first document does not embrace all of the ideas it needs to embrace in the future, and we have been very grateful for the input from the many who have already read it and commented on it. At this point we are receiving those comments, we are trying to coalesce them into a document that we expect to be released late in the Spring or early in the Summer, a second edition of the first draft of a national program statement.

In addition to the comments that we are seeking from outside, we are contracting with a number of individuals to write us specific papers in areas of their expertise, so that attached to a program document we expect to have some significant associated papers that will outline the Commission's ideas, and we expect to adopt and adapt the ideas we get from our contractors to fit our program, but they will form a part of the national document. We will prepare supporting justification for the program statement, and we will lead in the direction of preparing a legislative request in which we hope to formulate a program that goes beyond a mere program statement and does become an action document.

The Commission has done some other things beside work on the program document to which it said it would give 100% of its efforts. These represent the 101%, 102% and so on. We have held an additional hearing, as I mentioned earlier. The Westat Corporation has been working on a program of which you heard mention earlier and which will be coming to us in the Spring, and we will share it quickly with you. Government Studies and Systems, Incorporated, in Philadelphia, is preparing a report for us on public library funding for the future. We continue to be interested in areas of academic library funding, school library funding, independent research library funding, but we have no specific studies in those areas. Catholic University will soon deliver to us a report on how national programs in continuing education can best be forwarded. We are watching with care the legislation on the White House Conference on Library and Information Services that has been proposed in both the House and the Senate. We are preparing to handle the administrative details of that Conference if they are thrust upon us.

Let me return to the opening point. I have touched on some highlights of what the Commission has been doing. I hope that those of you who are interested in what I feel is a very important work will keep in touch with me and with the Commission's members. We would welcome your comments and ideas about what we are doing and planning. We cannot do it alone; we need your continued involvement. Thank you very much.

* * * *

ARL Commissions and Committees

MR. BUDINGTON: I would like now to turn to an information element which is labeled on the agenda "Changes in the Role of Commissions and Committees." It was brought to the attention of the membership last Spring, and perhaps even earlier, that consideration and study was being given to the Association's structure as it has existed for the past three years.

The genesis of the changes has come about as a result of perhaps two influences: 1) the charge given to us by Thomas Buckman in 1971, when he proposed the realignment of our organizational structure with the caveat that we take a look at it in a few years to see how well it was functioning; 2) we found ourselves involved during this year, in a review of the role and objectives of ARL as expressed in the Statement which was approved earlier this afternoon. So the Board and Officers during 1973 have been giving considerable thought to the way in which the commission and committee structure has or has not been functioning, as the case may be.

This thinking led to a meeting which was held in New York City on November 19. The meeting consisted of the Executive Committee, the Commission Chairmen and the ARL staff. The purpose of this meeting was to engage in substantive discussions which would review the relationships between the Board of Directors, the commissions, the committees, and finally, the ARL Office itself.

A number of recommendations came from that meeting regarding revisions in our original structure of the commissions and the committees. It was felt that the changes proposed will improve the effectiveness of the Association in acting, reacting, initiating, and in general achieving the goals which we hope to reach. The recommendations from that meeting were brought to the Board at its meeting yesterday. The following statements will summarize the thinking of the Board. [Appendix E of these Minutes outlines the details of the revised organizational structure].

To begin with, the Board itself was reaffirmed as the major decision making and policy making body of the Association. It is the guiding force in determining the activity needed to achieve goals, and is responsible for continually reviewing and assessing performance of ARL working groups, including commissions, committees and other elements of our structure. As to the commissions, they carry the responsibility for identifying broad issues in the respective areas which have been assigned to them, of studying the objectives of the Association within these areas, and assessing the future directions for the Association.

It is intended that the commissions will operate in an advisory capacity to the Board, and will not have an operational function. This is one of the first changes that you may see. Up to the present time the committees were assigned specifically to commissions which oversaw their activities, made recommendations for membership, monitored the activities, and in fact, reported to you on these activities.

The commissions functioned in a line role, without on the other hand giving up their staff function; this is where a conflict in some cases appeared to arise. We hope this will be corrected by keeping the commissions' functions at a staff level, rather than a line or operational level. The second change is that Board members will be assigned as chairmen of the commissions. Up to the present time this has not been the case. There has been a member of each commission on the Board to carry out a liaison function, but we will from this point on, assign the chairmanship of each commission to a Board member.

As to the committees, there will now be two different kinds of groups: first will be standing committees, and I used that term earlier with respect to the establishment of a Standing Committee on Interlibrary Loans. These committees will be established on the recommendation of the Board or of a commission. They will have general responsibilities for specific areas of continuing concern, such as federal relations, preservation, interlibrary loans. The committees will now be coordinated and monitored directly by the ARL office, rather than directly by the commissions. Members of the committees will be appointed for two-year terms which are renewable, and the work of the committees will be fully reevaluated every two years.

In addition to the standing committees, there is a title (new to the ARL) called "task force". These task forces will be established by the Board also on the recommendation of the Board or of a commission. They will be expected to perform defined tasks in specific periods of time, with designated outcome or products, and they also will be monitored by the ARL Office.

Finally the ARL Office itself is seen as the central coordinating body, which is responsible for all operational aspects of the Association.

This was the substance of the findings of the November meeting which were brought to the Board at its January meeting. Following that November meeting, the commissions were charged with reviewing all of the existing committees to determine whether they should be retained as standing committees or as task forces or be discharged. The commissions were also instructed to review the major issues of concern and the directions of the Association within the areas of their assignments. The commissions reported to the Board Thursday evening, and some of the contents of these reports you will be hearing shortly. Thus the principal decision taken by the Board is as follows:

In conjunction with the commissions' reports and recommendations, all present commissions and committees were discontinued. The commissions will be reconstituted in the same five areas. According to the changed membership requirements the chairman of each commission will be drawn from the Board of Directors. Such committees will be reconstituted as standing committees as were recommended by the commissions, and in addition, new committees and task forces will be established as recommended by the Board. I have already mentioned one Standing Committee on Interlibrary Loan and a task force assigned the responsibility of monitoring the national periodical resource center study.

This is a summary of the changes in the role and structure of commissions and committees which has now been carried out by the Board.

I would like now to turn to the reports of the Commission chairmen. We will lead off as usual with the Commission on Development of Resources, Douglas Bryant, chairman.

* * * *

Commission on Development of Resources

[The Report of this Commission is included as Appendix F of these Minutes.]

MR. BRYANT: As the President has said, the existing commissions are all being dissolved forthwith, so that I have the honor of being the first of the lame ducks. As was also said, each of the commissions was asked to provide to the Board recommendations for particular concerns which each commission felt the Association ought to address in the immediate future. I would like to indicate briefly to you the five subjects which the Commission on the Development of Resources regards as of primary concern to the Association at this time.

The first one we have heard a great deal about from Charles Stevens, and that is we believe and recommend to the Board that the Association give very particular attention in the immediate future to working closely with the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, with particular reference to the development of its national program. There have been as Mr. Stevens indicated, a series of information discussions and the Commission on External Affairs of the Association is turning its institutional attention in that direction.

We think that the Association should at this time pay particular attention to developing increasingly supportive relationships, as we term them, between the Association of Research Libraries and the Center for Research Libraries. We believe that in the years just ahead of us, as various forms of interlibrary collaboration and cooperation are being emphasized, this particular relationship between the Association and the Center requires special attention.

The third subject which we commend to the Association for study and for action at this time is the far-reaching question of the relationship between public and private responsibility for disseminating resources for research. All of us are aware of the extremely grave concerns which we have with respect to the production and the dissemination of knowledge and the resources for research in every field. There are economic, cultural, social, and intellectual problems here of grave concern. Libraries are but one element in this. There are also implications for the conduct of research and the development of academic careers.

Economically speaking, the more that libraries work together in various forms of collaborative efforts the fewer copies of various kinds of publications may be needed. Here one thinks particularly of serials and vast microform projects where the more these are made to serve the purposes not of one library, but of multiple collections of libraries, the graver become the economic questions involved. We believe that this is a matter which needs the most important sort of study. It is the view of a number of us that ultimately what ought to happen here is that an organization, such as the Carnegie Corporation, might be asked to conduct a study. Note we are not suggesting that Carnegie finance a study done by somebody else, but that they conduct the study.

The last two of our recommendations have quite specifically to do with the development of resources for scholarship. The first of these involves the question of the role that libraries as libraries should play in the immediate and in the longer term future in the development of computer-based resources for research, both bibliographical and textual. Finally, we believe the Association ought in some way or another, to give attention to the necessity as we see it for the systematic collection of popular and of fugitive literature.

* * * *

Report of the Commission on Organization of Resources

[The report of this Commission is included as Appendix G of these *Minutes*].

MR. McELDERRY: The redefinition of the functions of commissions has forced very careful assessment of where the commissions are, what they have been doing, and the work of various committees. My assignment as chairman of this commission came very shortly before the redefinition of the role of commissions, and so I met with the commission members, including William Budington, our President, and Joseph Treyz. We reviewed rather carefully what the commission's function was, and what the activities of the committees thathave been associated with it had been. I might review some of this with you since you may not be fully aware of the roles.

The charge of the Commission on Organization of Resources is to seek means of improving and extending bibliographic control of research library materials, including methods of ordering and processing these materials to insure the greatest compatibility of form, economy of staff effort and institutional expenditures, and usefulness to readers. The commission has had two committees assigned to it. One has been the Committee on Machine Based Serials Records that is chaired by John McGowan, and the other is the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee chaired by Frederick Wagman.

The work of these two committees was reviewed. John McGowan was able to meet with the commission in early December. We saw the basic role of the commission as supporting activities to promote the development of a comprehensive, efficient and dependable national access system to resources of scholarly significance. Within that general framework we looked at the limited efforts that had been made in the past and made several recommendations.

Some of these overlapped to some extent with some of the other commissions. The first one was that there should be a formal and comprehensive response by the Association of Research Libraries to the National Commission report that was just discussed. We saw the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee as being a standing committee that would monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of this program as conducted by the Library of Congress. A third recommendation was that the Association of Research Libraries continue to participate in efforts to develop a national serials data base, and if you heard Mr. Livingston's report, that has made rapid progress since the meeting of the commission. We felt that we should keep ourselves informed and participate in any appropriate way in that effort.

We had a similar recommendation with respect to the exchange of cataloging information in machine-readable form, which is also an activity that the Council on Library Resources has been supporting. We felt that we should actively promote the development of a national union catalog of such information.

The fifth recommendation relates to a project of considerable interest to some ARL libraries, and that is, to explore the advantages and disadvantages of closing the card catalog and to determine the conditions and methods by which such action would be desirable. The sixth recommendation was made in recognition of the fact that the commission has some responsibility in the area of acquisitions, not in terms of resource development, but in terms of the methods involved in that process. We felt here that ARL should attempt to define or assess various patterns of collection development in the hope of determining a pattern that would relate to such things as blanket ordering, approval plans, the issue of differential pricing to libraries that Mr. Bryant mentioned earlier and related issues.

The final recommendation gets somewhat out of our area, and into the area of access to information: the Commission on Organization of Resources relates closely to efforts regarding the development of national resource centers, periodical center concepts, and other activities which may disburse or complicate the development of truly comprehensive bibliographic tools. We felt this was an area that should be looked at. With the exception of the Committee on the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, we felt the other recommendations should be handled by task forces. I think I should indicate that if the commission is to function effectively, it has to keep fully informed of the activities of the committees, which means there needs to be a lot of informal contact with at least the chairmen of these committees, in addition to seeing whatever reports are generated. I think it also suggests that we need the input from the membership at large on problems that are within the purview of this particular commission or any of the commissions, so that we can give proper attention to these problems.

* * * *

Commission on Access to Resources

[The report of this Commission is included in Appendix H of these Minutes].

MR. LATHEM: The Commission on Access to Resources, which consists of Virginia Whitney, David Weber and myself has met three times since the May membership meeting of the Association in New Orleans. In addition to devoting our attention to various facets of the general areas of the commission's responsibility, we have in the past six months given particular attention to the subject of interlibrary lending, this with respect to the ARL advisory committees for the three interlibrary loan studies which have recently been concluded. In July in New York, the commission met with the chairmen of these committees and the result of that session was a recommendation to the ARL Board of Directors that a gathering be scheduled to precede this Chicago membership meeting at which the personnel of the three advisory committees would be present along with the principal investigators of the studies and others, to engage in a coordinated review of the findings of the studies, and to reach some conclusions as to recommended courses of action for the immediate future, consistent with ARL's interests in the overall realm of interlibrary lending. That meeting was held on Thursday here at the Palmer House. The morning session was effectively presided over by the President-elect, Ralph Hopp, and the afternoon deliberations were in the able hands of Rutherford Rogers. Since you have heard the results of this meeting, I will not devote more attention to that beyond a very genuine expression of gratitude on the part of the commission to those who participated on Thursday, and most especially to Rutherford Rogers.

In the area of library services to external scholars and commercial users, which is a concern of the commission, we have been provided a paper by David Kaser just prior to his departure from Cornell and from the Association. This paper will now be used as a basis for a recommended projection coming from an informal committee consisting of Richard Chapin, Richard O'Keeffe and Natalie Nicholson, which in the new terminology may be designated as a task force.

Of the two standing committees to which the commission has borne a relationship, the Committee on Data Bases and the Committee on Access to Rare Books and Manuscripts, both have met in the period since the New Orleans meeting; both are clearly alive and active. The membership will shortly receive as the President has specified, a copy of the report of the Committee on Data Bases. Finally, in response to an inquiry from the Board of Directors regarding future and major issues of concern and direction of approach for the Committee on Access to Resources, we have indicated that such continue to be those outlined in the basic document of the commission dated December 1971, copies of which have been distributed to the membership, and are still available to any who might wish them.

* * * *

Commission on Management of Research Libraries

[The Report of the Commission is included as Appendix I of these Minutes.]

MR. HAAS: The Office of University Library Management Studies has sent to all members prior to the meeting our annual report along with another statement that assesses the Management Review and Analysis Program. Duane Webster will comment on the activities of the office.

MR. WEBSTER: I will describe briefly a few of the activities that are included in our annual report. First of course is the Management Review and Analysis Program which as you know, is a set of guidelines for a research library to use in conducting an internal review and analysis of its management practices. To date we have had fourteen member libraries participate in this Program. The first group was a pilot test of the Program. That group of libraries has completed the project and is in the process of implementing the results. Each of these three libraries has produced a management analysis report; those reports are available from the institutions. The second group of six libraries began the Program in May of last year, and has worked to the final phase. Reports have already been produced by two libraries from this second group, and the remaining four libraries are in the process of producing that final document.

The third group of five libraries started the Program in November of this last year. They are about at the midpoint. They are working with a revised program that has been improved as a result of the experiences of the pilot tests. On the basis of these three applications we did produce an assessment that is appended to our annual report. Also, a paper prepared by the office describing how the Program operates will be published in College and Research Libraries in March.

In terms of future directions for the Program, we do envision a fourth group beginning in the late Spring or in the Fall. A number of libraries have indicated interest, and the timing for the group will be dependent on their schedules. Beyond that group, we will offer MRAP applications at the request of members. We do expect however to make the Program available to non-members under certain circumstances. Those circumstances would include a group that is not fully subscribed to by membership, and it would also be based on payment of a fee by the non-members for participation in the Program. Beyond that we have also been exploring the possibility of adapting the MRAP process to college and smaller university libraries. We have been discussing this with Beverly Lynch at ACRL, and will continue to explore it.

The second project I want to mention is the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC). As you know, this Center was set up this year to collect and provide access to some of the management documents and management experiences of member libraries. We have initiated this Center with two major surveys, one concerned with goals and objectives and the second with a series of personnel topics. As an outgrowth of those surveys to which there was a good response from the membership, we have established the SPEC files. So far six files have been developed covering the following topics: goals and objectives statements, organization charts, personnel officers, status of librarians, staff development efforts and affirmative action plans. These files contain documents and information collected in the survey. We provide access to the files through a series of SPEC Flyers. These Flyers provide bri[illegible]ports on the results of the surveys and also describe what is availa[illegible] the files.

In addition to the SPEC Flyers which have been distributed to you and to your liaison persons, we have also established a group of SPEC kits. These are packages of illustrative documents in each of the surveyed areas. For example, in the area of affirmative action, we have put together a collection of illustrative affirmative action plans that we can provide in response to a request or an inquiry. We charge only for the cost of reproducing the illustrative documents provided in the kit. As we go on with that program, we expect to establish additional files on some of the other topics that we have already surveyed, and we hope to do some additional surveys. Other surveys that are being considered include management uses of statistical information and budgeting techniques and formats. The key to the success of this undertaking is the continued support of the membership, particularly the liaison people in each library. Unless they provide the information and the documents necessary to set up the files, and then direct inquires to us, the service cannot be continued. To date we have had 125 requests for the SPEC kits and packages of information.

The third project is really a "return on investment" type of report. As you know the Columbia study at long last was published this year, and a copy has been sent to each of you. Additional copies are available directly from the publisher. Beyond the Columbia study itself there is the effort made by the staff at Columbia to come to grips with the report, and to implement the major recommendations outlined in the study. The result of that staff activity is a report that will be made available to the membership shortly. This report is in fact a detailed examination of the recommendations made in Booz, Allen and Hamilton study and considers how the recommendations will be implemented.

The Office has also been involved in a number of workshops concerned with continuing education and the training of library managers. These activities are reported in greater length in the annual report.

MR. HAAS: Very briefly a few other points. The commission has met several times in the last six months. There are several topics that we have done something about: first is library personnel. By participating in the MRAP Program, many ARL staff members have already had an opportunity to develop new skills and insights into the management process, but it seems probable that additional work on methods of personnel training, analysis and composition of the staff and the prescription for professional education will be required at some point. An early prospect seems to be the development of some self-contained training programs in specific management areas which might be used within ARL libraries as part of the staff development program. The Office is also considering a project to assess existing training material and the development of a collection of the best available films, courses, etc., which could be maintained in the Office and made available for use by members on request.

More difficult to accomplish is the demanding kind of investigation that would provide further insight into the skills and perceptions required if library staffs are to accomplish well the full range of research library service obligations. It is not clear how deeply the Office can or should go in this and related areas of library education, but ARL's interest in the general topic of library education is and continues to be substantial.

The discussion earlier this afternoon suggests the need to improve both the quality and utility of quantitative data about libraries. Much data is assembled for diverse uses: for reports to institutions, for State and Federal Government agencies, for analytical purposes, etc. It is difficult for ARL to assume a dominant role in specifying what and how data should be collected. Still the subject is an important one and needs attention. Several steps for the Office have been suggested: first, it might be possible to assess the information currently gathered and distributed by ARL to improve comparability and utility; second, we will consider contracting for analytical studies and would explore further financial questions related to library operations, looking especially at the links between library expenditures and library performance; third, a related topic of essential interest is a projected survey of data presently collected in ARL libraries for local use. Depending upon the findings, the products of such a survey might include case studies of how data is put to use in such management processes as resource allocation, budget presentation and long-range planning.

Finally the commission joins with many others in acknowledging the performance of Mr. Webster, Mr. Gardner and other members of the staff of the Office, because the work of that Office has been marked by imagination, skill and energy, with substantial benefits to the Association and its members.

It is also well to remember, and the commission has reminded the Board of this, that the funding for the Office is drawn largely from the grant made to ARL by the Council on Library Resources, which continues for a number of months. A portion of the cost of the Office is, however, now drawn from the funds of the Association itself. The commission feels that it is not too soon to begin to plan for the future of the Office of

Management Studies. The level of use of the efforts of Mr. Webster and his staff suggests that the Office is an important venture of the Association. It is imperative, we think, that the momentum of the Office not be jeopardized by cutting too close the lead time for future funding. We consider the Office an important part of ARL, and its importance for the Association will continue on into the future.

* * * *

Commission on External Affairs

[The report of this Commission is included as Appendix J of these Minutes.]

MR. MCDONALD: Since my last report to you at the New Orleans meeting in May, this commission has been occupied with two major undertakings: the first of these is the preparation of a paper setting forth the position of the Association with respect to the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education. Entitled "The Financing of the Research Library" this paper was the work principally of commission member William Dix of Princeton. Those of you who have read the paper know it to be a fair and well-reasoned appeal for Federal support for the kinds of libraries that comprise this Association. In a slightly adapted form, this statement has also been used as part of ARL's testimony in favor of the proposed White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services. The efforts to secure a place for libraries in the thinking of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education also involved a meeting with the Executive Director of the National Commission and members of his staff. Representing the ARL were President Budington, Stephen McCarthy, Richard Couper, who is the other member of the ARL commission, and myself. I think all would agree that we received a very fair hearing, but the report of the National Commission which I understand is to be released later this month, will indicate whether or not our appeal was persuasive.

The other major task before the ARL commission, as you have been told several times already today, is to prepare on behalf of the ARL, a response to the draft plan of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Charles Stevens has had a good deal to say about that program, and I assure you that ARL is paying attention to it. As Mr. Stevens said, it was released in October and will be revised in the light of suggestions received from this and other groups, and a new version will be forthcoming later this Spring or Summer. I believe it is hoped that all comments will be in the hands of the NCLIS Committee working on the revised draft by April.

The ARL Board discussed this matter yesterday and agreed that the Commission on External Affairs should seek the advice of the other ARL commissions. May I add that the commission will also welcome suggestions of all members with respect to the National Commission's plans. As Mr. Budington has told you, the commission chairmen, the Executive Committee and the ARL Staff met in New York on November 19 to review the present commission structure which has been in effect since the Summer of 1971. As a result of that meeting, each commission was instructed to consider its goals and activities in the light of the statement of ARL Mission and Objectives. Accordingly I presented to the ARL Board at its meeting on Thursday evening of this week a brief report. I think I would like to read from that report so that you will have approximately what was said about its future: This commission has functioned more as a committee than as a commission. It has tended to deal directly with targets of opportunity in this area of responsibility and concern.

In part this is because until recently the Federal Relations Committee, the principal committee within the commission, has been without a chairman; thus, work that would normally concern the committee has instead been chaired by the commission and the ARL staff. However, because the chairman of the commission has also been a member of the ARL Executive Committee, the commission has tended to pattern its activities after the Executive Committee, and to function more as an operating body than as a coordinating and monitoring agency. That this situation exists is not to say that it is desirable. Very likely changes are in order, and certainly some will be made in light of the suggestions at the November 19 meeting of the ARL officers and commission chairmen and staff.

It is interesting to note that the initial charge to this commission as put forth in the Buckman proposal of March 29, 1971, assigned rather direct responsibilities to the commission. The exact langage is:

> "to study the legislative, administrative and judicial policy and trends within the Federal government as they relate to the interests and objectives of research libraries, and to bring these interests and objectives to the attention of the Congress, Federal agencies and persons representing them in ways which will engage their support of the national community of research libraries serving higher education, government and society at large."

The statement goes on to observe that the commission will ordinarily be concerned with broad issues and programs of interest to all of the other commissions. This is all the more reason why the commission's activities have been largely inseparable from those of the Executive Committee and staff.

The original Buckman charge for this commission confines itself to the relationship between the ARL and the Federal government. The present name of the commission recognizes the fact that the ARL has many other external relationships of great importance, with educational and professional groups, with foundations and funding agencies, and even occasionally, with foreign governments and international organizations. Inevitably, many of the routine aspects of these relationships have been handled by the Executive Director and his staff, since the ARL office is so often the initial point of contact for other organizations.

On the other hand, where the relationship has been an important or a promising one, the staff has been quick to seek the involvement of the membership through the appropriate channels of this Commission on External Affairs. Thus, the commission has been involved over time in discussions with officers of the American Council on Education, Council on Library Resources, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, and other agencies, governmental and non-governmental. Activities of these kinds seem to be entirely consistent with the statement of ARL Mission and Objectives, and particularly continuing objectives two and three which state that the ARL "seeks the understanding and support of governmental agencies and other appropriate organizations," and "cooperates with other educational and professional groups in undertakings of mutual interest."

In practice, the Commission on External Affairs has gone about meeting the requirements of these objectives largely in response to initiatives arising outside of the Association of Research Libraries. If any change in the role of the commission is indicated, that change should probably be in the direction of a more aggressive effort to develop initiatives from within the ARL, together with an improved effort for communicating ARL positions to others. Such change will not come easily. First it will require the identification of issues of major concern to the Association. Many of these issues are already known as a result of the work of the other ARL commissions, and many of them have just been expressed to you by those commission chairmen. Second, it will require the ordering of priorities for dealing with these substantive issues. This could be a task for further joint meetings of officers, staff and commission chairmen.

Third, it will require the preparation and ratification of statements reflecting the ARL position on these issues. If two meetings a year are not sufficient for the purpose, additional ways must be found for reaching the membership and incorporating their ideas into any such position papers. Last, as I have said earlier, it will require more effective means of communicating persuasively with those who have the power to translate the wishes of the Association into tangible support.

* * * *

Executive Director Search Committee

MR. BUDINGTON: I have occasion now to insert one additional item in the agenda to announce to you some news which may be known to many of you, but some of you perhaps are not aware of this. We have received from Stephen McCarthy his letter indicating his retirement as Executive Director of the ARL effective December 31, 1974. Accordingly, the Executive Committee conferred on next steps, and as a result I appointed a search committee last month chaired by Warren Haas. The members of this committee are Page Ackerman, Richard Boss, Rutherford Rogers and Basil Stuart-Stubbs. I have asked Mr. Haas to comment on this task.

MR. HAAS: Our goal is a simple one. It is to identify for the Executive Committee and the Board an individual or individuals who in our judgement will provide for ARL the leadership it requires. Our hope is to move as quickly as possible. We hope that you as members of the Association will think with us about the nature of our obligation and bring to our attention names, judgements, reflections you might have on this assignment that we have. Hopefully, starting no later than the conclusion of this meeting you will take an opportunity to talk to the members of the search committee directly if you have a message to give. All of us will welcome any letters or suggestions that you might have in the next few weeks.

I would underscore that I hope we can move quickly to fulfill the task that the Board has assigned to us simply, because it is a job that has to be done and done well. We cannot allow any chance at all of loss of momentum in ARL. We want to keep up the clarification of purpose, and the clarification of the organization expressed in the statement that has been discussed and approved earlier today. I think they provide our guidelines for the future.

* * * *

Report of the Executive Director

MR. BUDINGTON: I will call now on Mr. McCarthy for his annual report to the membership.

MR. MCCARTHY: One of the advantages of the commission organization is that all of the substantive matters are reported by commission and committee chairmen, and this makes my job short and easy. There are really only two or three items which I have to report to you and which I believe will not be covered by others.

Mr. Haas has already spoken in appreciation of the work of the Office of Management Studies. I would like to second and support that statement and go on to say that I think throughout the office staff in Washington, we have a dedicated, able and hard working group of people. I am deeply appreciative of their efforts. We have a bookkeeper who is very good with numbers, not very good with English. She did however last week, present the financial report for the past year labeled "Unaudit." It showed that we had finished the year in the black!

To turn to two matters of substance. There have been passing references to copyright during the past few days, and there are one or two things that I would like to say about it. It has been reported that the William and Wilkins Company will carry their copyright suit against the U.S. Government to the Supreme Court. I do not know that this is official, but it has been so reported. We have discussed with the Board and with Philip Brown, our lawyer in Washington, the question of the ARL continuing to associate itself as an amicus when this case goes to the Supreme Court. If the report which we heard is true, it is Mr. Brown's expectation that this case would be heard in the Fall term of 1974 by the Supreme Court. We have tried to budget a reasonable sum of money to cover these activities if they occur.

Another aspect of copyright is copyright revision. As you know this has been in the Congress for years and there is no real assurance when it will come out. Senator McClellan's committee did hold hearings on S. 1361 last summer. The ARL, the ALA and the Medical Library Association proposed an amendment which we believe would clearly authorize the photocopying of a single article in a journal in response to a request from an individual, who would use the article for personal study or research. This of course was opposed by the copyright owners, but at least for the time being, I am pleased to note that the staff of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights has inserted new language in S. 1361 which specifically says that such photocopying is not an infringement of copyright. Of course there is always some off-setting factor. In a subsequent paragraph which the staff has also added, they refer to what they call "systematic photocopying." They cannot define it, but they regard systematic photocopying as an infringement. We were invited to help them define it and we tried, but without success. We did urge, however, that a large volume of photocopying requiring orderly procedures should not be the definition.

This bill is supposed to come before the Subcommittee in the course of the next month. [As of March 15, Subcommittee consideration had been re-scheduled for April 10]. If the bill moves through the Subcommittee, it will go then to the full Judiciary Committee and then to the Senate floor. The Chief Counsel of the Committee is reasonably optimistic that this will happen in the year 1974 and that the Senate will vote a copyright law. That is the most optimistic prediction. Even if that occurs, the bill will go to the House sometime in 1975. There would be extended House hearings and when a bill would emerge from the House is anybody's guess. Of course a more pessimistic outlook might be that the bill would not even move through the Senate this year. About this we will know next November.

To turn to another matter which has not been referred to, although we have run some items in the Newsletter on it, I can report a little more progress with the International Education Project of the American Council on Education, with which we have been able to associate ourselves. The proposed mode of operation of this group led by Stephen Bailey, the Vice President of ACE, is to have a series of five or six task forces that will look at various aspects of the problem of international education. I should probably say that while the words "international education" do not mean exactly the same as language and area studies, the International Education Project is concerned with language and area studies.

There will be a task force on library and information resources. I do not yet know who the members will be. There will be a modest amount of staff support provided by the project for this effort. The task force will be expected to work very rapidly, mainly within the next four months. Task forces are expected to report early in the summer to the Steering Committee of the Government/Academic Interface Committee of which I am a member. The Steering Committee will review the reports of the several task forces and, with staff assistance, develop the final report for the Federal government and the membership of the American Council and affiliated organizations. I do not know how much good we can do here, but at least libraries are not going to be completely overlooked.

* * * *

Report for the President

MR. BUDINGTON: I would like to say that we are all most grateful to Stephen McCarthy, to our Assistant Executive Director, Suzanne Frankie, Duane Webster, Jeffrey Gardner and all of our devoted staff of the ARL office.

Following the reports of our five Commission chairmen and reports of other substantive recent occurrences, it would be redundant to synthesize any annual summary of events. They do fall somewhat neatly into categories of introspection and extroversion, and the first category I need hardly mention. Areas which should be singled out include: the quite searching studies in the areas of Association character and objectives, our operational structure and the criteria of our membership; in the outer world we will long remember the Williams and Wilkins experience, not yet done with; the equally important pending revision of copyright legislation;

our representations in the halls of government is a continuing responsibility of our office and your officers, whether it is before a number of important national commissions and government agencies or on rather short notice at a critical committee hearing.

This year has also seen the undertaking and conclusion of the studies on interlibrary lending and the planning efforts which are to follow, with quite significant results as I am sure you will all agree. Our Office of University Library Management Studies as you have heard, is developing in ever more farreaching ways. We continue to be grateful to the Council on Library Resources and its president, Fred Cole, for their deep interest, strong support and guidance, particularly as we begin to stand on our own feet.

Finally, we have also turned our eyes to challenges visible in the approaching future with the establishment of two task forces not yet mentioned whose charges are of considerable magnitude. One will relate to the framing of a study on the responsibilities and relationships between the elements of the information community, these elements which deal in and have bearing on the creation and dissemination of knowledge. This is the tip of an iceberg which goes far beneath the surface, as we know. We feel somewhat chilled by the threat, but we also find ourselves labelled a threat by others in this same community.

The second task force will come to grips, if it can, with a concept posed sometime ago by Warren Haas, conceiving the possibility of a "research library corporation," in which we see the possibilities of effective cooperative efforts which may go beyond those which are possible within this professional association. Let us hope that our recent introspections will bring new strength and vision to all of us in our future excursions.

Now comes the time for me to express my deep and humble appreciation for the privilege accorded me this past year to serve as President of this body. Most of my predecessors have marveled at this great learning experience, and as one coming from that slightly offbeat, off-centered group of non-academic independent research libraries, I can truly say that it has extended my horizons many, many fold. This ends my comments and philosophy, such as it is, as a Presidential report.

Is there any other business which the membership would like to bring to the floor? If not, I would like to present to you your next President, Ralph Hopp, Director of Libraries, University of Minnesota.

MR. HOPP: I think now that Mr. Budington has achieved the enviable position of Ex-President we should take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the effective leadership that he has given this Association the past year.

I am sure that you have neither the time nor the inclination to hear an inaugural address at this hour of the day. However, since I am not going to give an inaugural address, I will restrict myself to an anecdote. Some 36 or 37 years ago, a young farm boy in Nebraska wrote a letter to a library administrator of the State University Library and asked whether he might possibly secure a parttime job in the library, so that he could go to the University. The library administrator responded saying that such jobs were typically only given to students already registered in the University, and the positions were filled on the basis of a competitive examination, but he somehow seemed impressed with the letter and said he would be willing to make an exception if this boy wished to take the examination. To make a long story short, that correspondence resulted in the first association that I had with Stephen McCarthy, and I say it because it is an interesting reflection that Stephen McCarthy and I were associated in the first year of my career in the field of librarianship, and here we are some 36 or 37 years later again associated in the last year of his career. I am of course very grateful that Mr. McCarthy has announced his resignation very close to the end of my year as President, because as all Presidents have in the last number of years, we are going to draw very heavily on him for assistance.

One final comment about this executive succession. I cannot remember anyone having the perquisites of succession that I have received, whereby the Ex-President in one swoop, dismissed all of the committees and commissions and task forces of the Association. As you know, the responsibility to appoint new members to these groups falls upon the President. I might say that the impact of that responsibility does not excape me, but I have been assured by other Ex-Presidents that the cooperative response from the members has always been very generous, and I will certainly call upon many of you I am sure to fill slots either new or vacant.

My chief responsibility this afternoon in taking over as President, is to ask if there is any new business to be brought forward? If not, then this meeting is adjourned.

* * * *

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

The present membership criteria, with which you are all familiar, were established in January, 1972, by your vote, with the understanding that a reevaluation of them would occur in two years. In a letter dated April 25, 1973, addressed to the Membership Committee, President Budington gave the following charge to the Committee:

1. To review the appropriateness of the criteria for admission to ARL and of the criteria for maintenance of membership.
2. To assess the effects of the new criteria on present and potential members.
3. To make recommendations to ARL membership at the January 1974 meeting.
4. To develop more substantive criteria for non-university libraries.

To carry out its instructions the Membership Committee met briefly in New Orleans in May and held an all-day meeting in Washington on October 3. Much information has been received from ARL headquarters and from librarians associated with non-university libraries.

From its deliberations the Membership Committee presents five recommendations for your consideration. It is proposed that each recommendation be discussed and voted on separately. The underlined portion of each recommendation that follows is the statement of criteria on which you are being asked to vote.

Recommendation 1

From a review of *Academic Library Statistics 1971-1972* it has been determined that five ARL libraries do not meet minimum requirements. Two of the five are deficient in one category, two are deficient in two categories, and [illegible] is deficient in three categories.

Generally speaking, these libraries not meeting all requirements are actively participating in and contributing to ARL activities, and, it is believed, ARL has proved its worth to these libraries. Furthermore, when changes in requirements are made, the Membership Committee is of the opinion that special consideration should be taken of charter and other long-term members. In other words, when drastic changes in membership requirements are made, grandfather clauses should be part of such changes.

Therefore the first recommendation of the Committee is:

Charter members and other long-term members will be given special consideration in meeting maintenance of membership requirements: As these members were admitted under different requirements, and as certainly in most cases they have actively participated in ARL, and, it is believed, as ARL has proved its worth to these libraries, they should normally be authorized to continue their memberships if they wish to do so.

To implement this recommendation the Committee suggests that these members explain to the ARL Board their situations, future plans of the institutions they represent, advantages of their memberships to the institutions they represent and to ARL, etc. The Board may, at its discretion, call upon the Membership Committee to study cases and make its recommendations to the Board. The Committee feels that some dialog should occur and some evaluation be made before continuations of membership are authorized.

Recommendation 2

The next three recommendations concern various specific quantitative criteria governing membership in ARL.

The Committee is of the opinion that the time has come when statistics of material in microform must be a factor to consider. Every ARL library has strengthened its collection and its information resources by additions of microforms.

The second recommendation follows:

Libraries will be asked to report volumes in hard copy and, in addition, one of the following: (a) actual volume count in the four categories of microfilm reels, microcards, microprint sheets, microfiches, and ultramicrofiches or (b) volume count based on these equivalents -

1 microfilm reel = 1 volume equivalent
8 microcards or microfiches = 1 volume equivalent
4 microprints = 1 volume equivalent
1 ultramicrofiche = 1 volume equivalent

Volume and volume equivalents will be totalled to form the critical resource statistics to be used in studying membership requirement.

Recommendation 3

Because of the confusion in terminology in practically everyone's mind about including serials under the heading "periodicals" the Committee makes this recommendation:

Item 6 on the 1972-1973 questionnaire, "Number of current periodicals, will read on future questionnaires: "Number of current serials including current periodicals."

Recommendation 4

The number of Ph.D.'s awarded is the requirement which a few member libraries and several promising potential members find impossible to meet. The large number of Ph.D.'s awarded by the giants in ARL cause the median figure in this category to be excessively high. The small, sound, mature institution and the developing institution are disadvantaged. Furthermore, it seems to the Committee that the number of fields in which a library has been judged by accrediting agencies and by their own institutions qualified to support Ph.D. programs is the statistic relevant to "collections and services--broadly based."

Therefore, the Committee makes this recommendation:

The statistic regarding the number of Ph.D.'s awarded continue to be collected, but that this category not be included in membership requirements.

Recommendation 5

The charge "to develop more substantive criteria for non-university libraries" seemed to be the most difficult task assigned the Committee. The criteria in the process of being written for membership in the Independent Research Library Association were given serious consideration. However, because these criteria are not easily converted into criteria established for ARL membership, and because not until February, 1974, are they to be considered by IRLA for adoption, it seemed unwise to attempt to recommend "more substantive" criteria at this time. In addition no non-university library not already in ARL is known to the Committee to be seeking membership in ARL.

Therefore, the Committee presents this recommendation:

The pertinent bylaw regarding non-university library membership in ARL continue to be followed: Invitations to other libraries shall be issued at the initiative of the Board of Directors after approval of the membership.

This recommendation seems not to call for any action by membership. However, membership or the Board of Directors may wish to direct the Committee to continue its study of this subject.

As none of the above recommendations conflict with Article II--Membership--of the Bylaws, no amendment to the Bylaws need be made. Only changes in the Regulations are necessary to implement any action taken by membership at ARL's business meeting in January.

* * * * * * * * *

The Committee wishes here to express its appreciation for assistance received from William Budington, Stephen McCarthy, James Henderson, Russell Shank, and Gordon Williams.

The members of the Membership Committee of ARL:

Ben C. Bowman
James V. Jones
Ellsworth C. Mason
Richard L. O'Keeffe
Howard Rovelstad, Chairman

November 28, 1973

APPENDIX B

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DATA BASES

The Committee met in Washington on Thursday, November 29, 1973, in the APSA Conference Room downstairs from ARL headquarters. Present were Richard De Gennaro, Richard O'Keeffe, Glenora Rossell, G.A. Harrer, Chairman, and at various times guests Duane Webster and Stephen McCarthy.

A wide ranging discussion was held about the general situation of research libraries and machine readable data bases, the costs and charges, the need for immediate access, and the possibilities that commercial service firms will come into being that will provide these services.

De Gennaro gave a report to the Committee on the activities of NASIC and the survey that is being made of library activities in the data base field by Wax, Morrison, and Gardner. It is obvious that the results of this survey will provide a great deal of guidance to the Committee for future activities and it was generally agreed that the Committee should volunteer any assistance it can to NASIC and to Jeff Gardner.

Following this there was a discussion of the charge to the Committee that it should consider what further to do with the Weber questionnaire. It was our unanimous conclusion that nothing further should be done with it at the moment until we learn the results of the NASIC survey.

Another possible activity of the Committee, the facilitation of exchange of information via a newsletter or the like, was discussed at some length. The members felt that the Committee could not support a separate newsletter but that it might well be part of the activities of NFAIS and it might be mentioned to Stella Kenan. (This has subsequently been done with questionable results.) It was further thought that an appropriate journal would be Advanced Technology/Libraries, which does seem to attempt to cover U.S. and international activity. (This proposal has also been made with very positive results.)

After further discussion it was generally concluded by the Committee that the developments in library utilization of data bases are coming thick and fast and that the Committee would be hard pressed to define its purpose in detail at this time. It was felt, however, that there is sufficient activity that the Committee should stay in business for the evaluation of developments in the field and referral of special questions for special study.

Duane Webster felt that the deliberations of the Committee should be communicated to the ARL Commission on Access.

Dr. McCarthy suggested that people involved in the development of machine readable data bases, but outside the library field, might well be invited to meet with the Committee from time to time.

It was the decision of the Committee to communicate these deliberations to the ARL Board of Directors and to intend to meet in Chicago at Midwinter.

Hugh Atkinson
Richard De Gennaro
Richard O'Keeffe
Glenora Rossell
Gustave Harrer, Chairman

November 29, 1973

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MACHINE BASED SERIALS

The data that the ARL libraries supplied in response to the Committee on Machine Based Serials questionnaire point to a sizable amount of activity and work with machine readable serial files. Of the 86 libraries who participated in the survey, 64 had M.R. files amounting to 1,723,586 converted serial titles in ARL libraries. Twenty-two libraries reported having no files with one library indicating that it was in the process of converting its file. A rough approximation of the cost of converting these files points to an outlay of over $1,500,000 and an unprecedented amount of duplicate conversion effort. Fifty-three libraries noted that their files covered their entire collection with most reporting that the coverage included periodicals, monographic serials, newspapers, and annual reports, and also cross references. Thirty-nine libraries noted inclusion of back files while 25 libraries contained only currently received serials. Records in most cases did not provide information on breaks in volume holdings. Six libraries reported having detailed information on holdings, ten reported general information, and only 13 libraries had detailed holding statements on unbound and current issues.

The serial files were used in a variety of ways of which the most frequently cited was for union list purposes. Twenty-three libraries reported that their serial file was part of a union list. These union lists include the holdings of 940 libraries, of which 500 were college and university, 204 public, 203 special, and 33 miscellaneous. Of those libraries reporting that their files were not part of a union list, 21 indicated plans were underway to create a list and 19 indicated an interest in such a venture. Only ten were not planning to produce a union list. It was clear from the responses that one of the principal reasons for the creation of M.R. serial files was for location purposes. Only a small percentage used their files for processing functions such as ordering, check-in, claiming, financial accounting, cataloging and bindery control. In this category of responses, financial accounting and ordering were cited most frequently with bindery control, check-in, and cataloging cited least frequently. The notable lack of large scale processing systems can be attributed not only to the inherent difficulties in handling serials, but also to the lack of easy access to files. Only five libraries had on-line access to their files. Ten libraries stored their files on punched cards, 51 on magnetic tapes and 26 on disks. With the exception of a few libraries that used Burroughs, UNIVAC, and CDC, IBM equipment clearly dominated the field, with 57 installations among member libraries. Any proposed cooperative serials program as currently under investigation needs to consider the predominance of certain hardware in the field. As to the cataloging and classification conventions, 56 libraries indicated that their serials were classified, with 51 classified in LC.

The majority of the records were judged to be at least partially compatible with the MARC format. Of the 66 libraries reporting on this question, four libraries indicated that their files were completely compatible with MARC, 41 noted some degree of compatibility, and 21 reported either unfamiliarity or incompatibility with MARC. In tabulating the data on the fixed and variable fields, there was no effort to identify which libraries used which data elements, only the frequency of use of the fields.

A review of these data shows a very low frequency of use for many data elements, with a few predictable exceptions. It is clear that there are only a few libraries which create a full MARC record, complete with all data elements and all indicators and subfields. It might also be argued that only a few of the essential elements are required in an initial conversion if there is the potential of introducing additional elements over time as needed. A case might also be made against every library's serial files being in full MARC content given the substantial cost of converting and maintaining these elements in the file. A select number of libraries might take on this assignment.

If there are any conclusions to be drawn from the findings, it is that a converted and cooperative program for dealing with the vast number of serials in ARL Libraries needs to be developed. There are only a very small number of libraries that have M.R. serial files of an acceptable level. The paucity of advanced M.R. serial systems suggests that this is an area where cooperative action can yield some real benefits. Indeed, there are several factors that suggest that serial programs throughout ARL libraries may be entering a new phase. Many libraries who converted their files within the last few years are now faced with the prospects of bringing these files into alignment with some of the newer practices. The cost of making such changes will be substantially larger than the original conversion. Estimates as high as double the original costs for converting to some level of MARC format would raise the cost from $1.00/record to as high as $2.00/record depending on the degree of MARC compatibility. An order of magnitude for all ARL libraries, if engaged in such a conversion, might run as high as two million dollars. It is for this strong economic reason that many libraries have deliberately delayed moving into this next phase, waiting for some new approaches to the problem. Two such prospects for a centralized and cooperative conversion program are currently under study. One study has been initiated by the ad hoc group on serial data bases, a committee of librarians interested in expediting serial conversion on a cooperative basis. The Chairman of the ARL Committee on Machine Based Serials is a member of this committee and has attended meetings in Los Angeles and Toronto. ARL has been following the work of the ad hoc group and has expressed interest in sponsorship. The Board has presented its views on this matter in a statement which was distributed to the ad hoc group. Within the last two months the Library of Congress has also indicated an interest in undertaking conversion of new serial titles. Representatives from the Library of Congress and the Chairman of the ad hoc group have recently met for the purpose of developing a cooperative effort in this area. At this point in time it appears likely that a steering committee representing the interests of ARL, ALA, CRL, CLA, NLM, NAL, etc. will be formed to advise the Library of Congress in any possible conversion program of serials. ARL should encourage this effort and assist in whatever way it can.

[The original appendices to this report are not reproduced here. They include a statistical breakdown of the responses to the questionnaire, list of ARL libraries who responded to the questionnaire, and an outline of the CONSER Project, which is discussed elsewhere in these Minutes].

Warren Boes
Ralph H. Hopp
William S. Budington
Norman Stevens
John P. McGowan, Chairman

January, 1974

APPENDIX D

REPORT OF
ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
COMMITTEE ON ROLE AND OBJECTIVES

MAY 21, 1973

The Association of Research Libraries views the portion of human endeavor wherein it finds its mission as being tripartite and as having the following form:

SOCIETY $\underset{\longleftarrow}{\overset{\text{SYSTEM FOR INTERACTION}}{\longrightarrow}}$ RECORDED INFORMATION

All of SOCIETY has need for RECORDED INFORMATION, and it utilizes and augments it through a multi-faceted SYSTEM FOR INTERACTION.

The Association works with one subset of each of these three elements. Whereas all of Society has information needs, the ARL is concerned essentially with those of researchers and of other persons in higher education, the professions, and the creative arts. Likewise, although the entire range of Recorded Information is potentially of some use to them, the ARL seeks to work with that segment of the record likely to be of greatest utility to its clientele. Moreover, while the System for Interaction has several components -- such as the publishing industry, government at several levels, and the broadcasting and information communities -- the primary concern of ARL is with the linking of scholars to information through its member institutions.

The energies of the Association, therefore, are focused on matters which are of special concern to large research libraries as distinct from problems shared by them with other kinds of libraries. The Association attempts to avoid duplication of work performed by other organizations and to concentrate its resources on those of its members' interests which might not otherwise receive adequate attention.

For these reasons the following statement of purpose has been developed for the Association:

> THE MISSION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES IS TO STRENGTHEN AND EXTEND THE CAPACITY OF ITS MEMBER LIBRARIES TO PROVIDE THE RECORDED INFORMATION NEEDED, BOTH NOW AND IN THE FUTURE, BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY.

In fulfillment of this design to facilitate effective access to research materials by scholars, the Association of Research Libraries maintains the four following continuing objectives:

1) In response to changing circumstances, it initiates and conducts studies, develops plans, and implements specific courses of collective action, on both interim and continuing bases, concerned with the acquisition, organization, preservation, and provision of research library materials, and with the management of research libraries;

2) It seeks the understanding and support of governmental agencies and other appropriate organizations;

3) It cooperates with other educational and professional groups in undertakings of mutual interest;

4) It assembles and distributes information pertinent to research libraries and their services, management, and organization.

Among activities in support of the first continuing objective given above, the Association aids in the determination of improved methods for acquiring, processing, and using materials in research library collections with greater speed and economy, including the evaluation and promotion of new technology in libraries. It also provides a framework within which collective programs can be operated which are beyond the capability of its members to mount individually. Recent examples of such activities are its management of the National Serials Pilot Project, the Microform Technology Project, the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project, and the operation of the Office of University Library Management Studies.

Consistent with its second continuing objective, the Association seeks effective representation of research library concerns to the Federal Government, including the review and assessment of existing legislation, the development of new legislation, and the meaningful implementation of legislation by appropriate Government agencies. Its work with the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, revision of the Copyright law, and the PL-480 program stand as examples of such efforts.

In support of its third continuing objective, the Association strives to work with national and international scholarly organizations and associations as means of improving awareness of research library problems and opportunities and of gaining better use of research resources by their clientele. To this end it maintains liaison with such diverse groups as the American Council of Learned Societies and the International Federation of Library Associations.

Its fourth continuing objective assures that the Association communicate with its members on a continuing basis to keep them informed of current critical issues and concerns from the field. Exemplifying this work are its many advisory services and publications, including the Association Minutes, the ARL Newsletter, the Foreign Acquisitions Newsletter, annual statistics and salary surveys, and other project reports.

Future projects and programs may be proposed by members, by the Board and Commissions of the Association, or by outside agencies and individuals. The appropriateness of Association involvement in such proposed projects and programs will be adjudged and largely determined against their relevance to this mission statement and these several continuing objectives.

APPENDIX E

ARL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

As Revised November 1973

A. The Board

The Board is the major decision making and policy making body of the Association. It is the guiding force in determining activities needed to achieve goals, and is responsible for continually reviewing and assessing performance of ARL working groups, including Commissions, Committees, and Task Forces, all of which are responsible to the Board. The Board will formally review and evaluate the performance of these groups every two years.

The Board consists of 9-12 members, five of whom will also serve as chairmen of the five Commissions. As Board members are elected, they will elect/be appointed* to serve as chairmen of Commissions.

B. The Commissions

The chairman of each Commission will be a member of the Board. Each Commission will serve in an advisory capacity to the Board, identifying broad issues and concerns, setting objectives, providing state-of-the-art analyses and assessment of future directions for ARL. In addition, the Commissions will make recommendations to the Board regarding ARL programs, inventory tasks to be done, and assess ARL performance. Commissions report directly to the Board. They will have no operational function in terms of working with or monitoring Committees, Task Forces etc. Each Commission will typically have three members, but may be composed of any number of individuals all of whom are appointed for three-year terms which are renewable.

ARL Office staff will work closely with the Commissions to assist them in carrying out their responsibilities.

Each Commission is required to prepare for the Board a written report annually which is to be available so that Board members may review the report prior to the Board meeting.

Each Commission should meet a minimum of twice a year, and as often as necessary.

---

*All appointments are made by the ARL President, acting on behalf of the Board.

C. Standing Committees

As appropriate, Standing Committees will be established by the Board acting upon recommendations of the Board and/or Commissions. These Committees will be given general responsibilities for consideration of specific areas of continuing concern (e.g. federal relations, preservation). These Committees will be expected to submit written reports through the ARL Office to the Board. Activities of these Committees will be coordinated and monitored by the ARL Office staff. Members of these Committees are appointed for two-year terms which are renewable. The Board will evaluate the performance of the Committees every two years.

D. Task Forces

As appropriate, Task Forces will be established by the Board acting upon recommendations of the Board and/or Commissions. These Task Forces will be organized to perform a defined task in a specific time period with an outcome or product designated. Task Forces will work closely with the ARL Office staff in discharging their responsibilities. Written reports will be presented to the Board through the ARL Office.

E. ARL Office

The ARL Office staff serves as the central coordinating body responsible for the operational aspects of the Association. Committees and Task Forces report to the Board through the Office. The staff works with these groups as well as the Commissions to carry out activities resulting from Board recommendations.

F. Representatives

The ARL President will designate ARL representatives to non-ARL groups. Representatives are charged with acting as liaison agents serving as the communication link between ARL and their designated groups. They will be appointed for a two-year term which is renewable. Each representative should submit a written report annually to the Board through the ARL Office.

Submitted by
Suzanne O. Frankie
Assistant Executive Director

November 22, 1973

APPENDIX F

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES

Minutes

Present: Douglas W. Bryant (Chairman); Page Ackerman; Basil Stuart-Stubbs.

ROLE AND OBJECTIVES OF ARL

The Commission had before it a number of documents relating to this subject.

In chronological order, these were:

29 March 1971	A New Committee Structure for ARL, by Thomas R. Buckman
21 May 1973	ARL Mission Statement
6 June 1973	Letter from Stephen A. McCarthy to John P. McDonald
10 October 1973	Memorandum from Warren J. Haas to the Executive Committee
30 October 1973	Memorandum from Suzanne O. Frankie to Stephen A. McCarthy
21 November 1973	Notes on November 19th, 1973 meeting of ARL Executive Committee, Commission Chairmen and Office Staff, by Suzanne O. Frankie

The Commission had a wide ranging discussion on ARL's role, objectives and organization. In these Minutes, the Commission's opinions and conclusions are set down in the same order of arrangement as in Mrs. Frankie's notes.

I. Organizational Structure

A. The Board. The Commission is in agreement with the arrangements described in the Frankie Notes.

B. The Commissions. The Commission favors the principle that Commission chairmen should be members of the Board; given the size of the Board it should be possible to select chairmen with interests and experience appropriate to each Commission. The Commission also believes that the Commission should not be asked to carry out executive or operational functions, and that these should be a responsibility of the ARL office. This would free the Commission to discuss questions of more general concern, as spelled out in the Frankie Notes. The increase in the number of members of Commissions is also seen as desirable; in the case of the Commission on the Development of Resources, if it were to take on a more philosophical role, it might be helpful to add such persons as Edmond L. Applebaum (LC) and Gordon R. Williams (CRL). Appointments for three-year terms are acceptable, given the provisos that they are renewable and that the terms of members overlap for the sake of continuity.

C. Standing Committees. The Commission agrees with the arrangements described in the Frankie Notes. In addition, it favors the inclusion in Standing Committees and in Task Forces of non-library experts (e.g., James Sharaf, a copyright specialist and legal counsel to Harvard) and of library specialists below the level of chief administrator.

D. Task Forces. Again, the Commission agrees with the arrangements described in the Frankie Notes. It would go further and advocate the use when appropriate of one-person Task Forces; this would be desirable when a specific topic required the concentrated attention of an individual particularly qualified to deal with it. This is in line with Warren J. Haas' suggestion that ARL make use of "member experts."

E. ARL Office. The Commission is in agreement with the Frankie Notes.

F. Representatives. The Commission is in agreement with the Frankie Notes.

II. Major Issues of Concern and Directions for the Future. The Commission draws the attention of the ARL Board to the following matters, which it believes should be of major concern to ARL:

A. The proposals of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science as they will affect scholarship and research in the United States.

B. The potential advantages to scholarship to be derived from increasingly supportive working relationships between the Association of Research Libraries and the Center for Research Libraries.

C. The far-reaching question of the relationship between public and private responsibility for disseminating resources for research. (See paragraph IV-A below, the specific recommendation in connection with Research Publications Inc. and the Center for Research Libraries.)

D. The role of libraries in the development of computer-based resources for research, both bibliographic and informational.

E. The systematic collection of popular and fugitive literature.

III. Committees Reporting to the Commission. In reviewing the Committees presently reporting to the Commission, it was decided, due to the continuous nature of their assignments, that, with one exception, they should all become Standing Committees, as follows:

A. Committee on Foreign Acquisitions and its Subcommittees.

The parent Committee should be dissolved and its functions of "identifying broad issues and concerns, setting objectives, providing state-of-the-art analyses" and assessing future directions in the field of foreign acquisitions should be taken over by the Commission on the Development of Resources in its new role. All area Subcommittees should become small Standing Committees and whenever possible should include representatives of the appropriate scholarly organizations. Experience indicates that these area Subcommittees, which work independently on specific problems, would not as separate Standing Committees impose a serious administrative burden on the ARL Office. It seems essential to the Commission that these Subcommittees, which are presently separated from the ARL Office by the two organizational layers of Commission and Committee, should be brought into direct relationship with the Office as set out in section I-E of the Frankie Notes.

B. Committee on the Center for Chinese Research Materials. This should be a Standing Committee for the duration of the project.

C. Committee on Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project. The concerns of this Committee are not restricted to the ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project, and the Commission therefore recommends that the name be changed to Standing Committee on Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm.

D. Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials. This Committee should become a Standing Committee.

The Commission has no new Standing Committees or Task Forces to recommend.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

A. Research Publications Inc. and Center for Research Libraries. The Commission discussed this situation at great length, attempting to weigh the arguments on both sides as objectively as possible.

The Commission is not in a position to advise either party, but believes that at this time no consortium should set a precedent by paying for materials at a differential rate; publishers, for their part, are under no obligation to sell to any customer. The Commission sees this particular debate as symptomatic of a much larger issue, proposed for ARL attention in Roles and Objectives, paragraph II-C above. There is an increasing number of instances wherein the traditional arrangements among parties to the creation and transmission of knowledge are being questioned and challenged. The Commission, believing that a thorough analysis of the situation is urgently needed, recommends to the ARL Board that ARL join with others in the scholarly community in seeking the most objective and searching inquiry into the impact on scholarship of the relationships among authors, publishers, libraries and users.

B. South Asian Library Resources Conference, 1974. The Commission has studied the outline of the proposed conference and notes that the Commission chairman has been invited to attend this meeting. This should be drawn to the attention of Mr. Bryant's successor as Commission chairman.

C. Subcommittee on Western European Materials. On 19 October Mrs. Frankie informed Howard Sullivan that the ARL Board agreed that for the present the Subcommittee should take no action in developing a successor to the Farmington Plan. It did propose that a survey be conducted in 1975 to assess the coverage of European publications in the accessions of member libraries. The Commission believes that responsibility for drawing up plans for this survey should rest with the Committee on Western European Materials.

D. American Council on Education. Mr. Bryant reviewed for the other two members circumstances relating to a proposed ACE Task Force on Resources, which the Commission sees as a desirable development. Mr. Bryant will continue to maintain liaison with ACE in regard to this Task Force.

Page Ackerman
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Douglas W. Bryant, Chairman

APPENDIX G

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF RESOURCES

The Commission on Organization of Resources is assigned the responsibility "to seek means of improving and extending bibliographic control of research library materials, including methods of ordering and processing these materials to ensure the greatest compatibility of form, economy of staff effort and institutional expenditures, and usefulness to readers." In line with the proposed mission of ARL "to strengthen and extend the capacity of member libraries "in serving the research community, the role of the Commission is to survey the needs in its general area of responsibility and to recommend actions which will lead to a coordinate approach to the major problems of the Association.

In reviewing the Commission structure in the light of the revised Statement of ARL Mission and Objectives, the ARL Board reinforced the role of Commissions in identifying broad issues and concerns in order to direct the activities of the Association. The Commission on Organization of Resources met on December 3, 1973 to review its current activities and to identify additional issues which should be recommended to the Board for action.

At the present time the Commission monitors the activities of the Committee on Machine Based Serials Records chaired by John P. McGowan, and the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee (NPAC) chaired by Frederick Wagman. It shares, with other Commissions, a concern for coordination in the development of research collections and improved bibliographic control particularly in the development of machine readable data bases. Little attention has been given directly to methods of ordering and processing of materials, which form part of the charge to the Commission.

The Committee on Machine Based Serials Records has been surveying ARL libraries to identify the existence of machine readable serial data bases and has represented ARL in the Ad Hoc Discussion Group on Serials Data Bases coordinated by Richard Anable of York University in Toronto. The latter group grew out of a York University investigation of the problems associated with machine readable serials files contracted for by the National Library of Canada and York University. Exploration of this complex problem led to informal discussions between a number of U.S. and Canadian libraries and the establishment of informal communication links. A series of meetings were held during 1973 with representation from the National Library of Canada, the Library of Congress, the National Serials Data Program, the Council on Library Resources, ARL, and a number of ARL libraries. The stated purposes of the Ad Hoc Group are:

1- The improvement of communications among institutions engaged in the generation and maintenance of serials data bases.

2- The establishment of a set of "agreed upon practices."

3- The investigation of future means of cooperative or coordinated serials record conversion of retrospective titles.

The primary interest is the creation of a union list of serials in machine readable form as rapidly as possible on a cooperative basis to avoid costly conversion efforts by individual libraries without benefit of common standards. Secondary objectives are stated as follows:

1- To assist the national libraries of both countries (Canada and the United States) in the establishment of a computer maintained (and hopefully remotely accessible) serials data system. This will be accomplished partly by the very existence of the resulting data base, and partly by the experience gained in its establishment

2- To assist in the definition of the roles of the regional or resource centres in such enterprises.

3- To provide a source data base for use within the International Serials Data System, and to seek the active participation of the Canadian and United States National Centres.

Problems relating to these objectives include the development of common standards for inputing records, identification of existing compatible data bases, development of a method for collecting data on-line, funding for terminals and communications, and the design of a coordinating mechanism. Formal affiliation with ARL is being explored as a means of enhancing the status of the project and providing the necessary coordination. Neither the National Serials Data Program nor the MARC Serials Distribution Service is currently in a position to develop a comprehensive national serials data base in machine readable form. Some other approach is necessary to forestall the continued development of incompatible local and regional data bases and to provide an essential national bibliographic tool for the library community.

The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee emerged from the Farmington Plan as the Library of Congress was able to expand its acquisition and cataloging of foreign materials. The program has substantially reduced the amount of original cataloging in ARL libraries but still falls short of the desired level of coverage. It has responded well to the problems of Chinese materials but is deficient in the acquisition of other foreign language materials. The University of Michigan is currently evaluating the performance of the program and is developing a methodology for evaluation by other libraries. There is need not only to improve coverage of foreign materials, but also to include other forms of material, such as microforms, and to increase the analysis of serial monographs. An increase in the speed of distribution of MARC tapes is also recommended by the Committee.

In reviewing these multiple efforts to establish comprehensive, efficient, and dependable access to resources of scholarly significance, the Commission feels that, although progress has been made in expanding coverage, achievements are still at a rudimentary level. Most ARL libraries have made significant strides in recent years in expanding their collections, but there is still a significant lack of planning and coordination on a national level to ensure broad bibliographic and physical access. Available bibliographic tools are a combination of local, national, and commercial products structured by subject and form of material. There is duplication of coverage and voids in indexing. There is lack of standardization in forms of entry and indexing terminology. There is an increasing number of uncoordinated efforts to resolve the problem on the local, regional, and national level but insufficient coordination to produce a national access system. Ability to share costs effectively to avoid duplication in collection development and bibliographic effort are limited. The deficiencies enumerated above are well known and of long standing and have been addressed by numerous professional groups. They are being dealt with currently by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. The potential cost savings to individual libraries are obvious and the need to realize these savings increases as funding sources dry up and inflation shrinks the library budget.

There is need for the vital, missing ingredient in strong, aggressive leadership at the national level to set objectives and standards to coordinate local efforts, and to undertake the necessary research and development effort. The national libraries are conscious of this need but lack policy support and adequate funding to assume the necessary leadership. Various commercial firms are attempting to fill the void and exploit the situation for financial gain. The corporate approach has been attempted on a limited scale with considerable success as illustrated by the Center for Research Libraries and the Ohio College Library Center. Library systems are emerging among state-supported institutions and on a voluntary basis on a regional and state basis. None of these efforts has or is likely to result in a total national system responsive to the needs of the library community or the general public.

There is a tendency to believe that the development of a national system is a federal responsibility and that little can be done until Congress acts. That view is counter-productive, for the recent history of federal leadership does not inspire confidence that it can provide dependable, long-term commitment. Short of complete subsidization, there is considerable profit to be gained from our own combined efforts. The library corporation approach following the Center for Research Libraries model might promise more immediate returns and be more responsive to the library community than a governmental agency which can be audited and controlled only in an indirect and cumbersome manner. The immediate requirement is to define more explicitly what our needs are and to assess what mechanisms will be most advantageous in accomplishing these goals.

The Commission on Organization of Resources recommends the following courses of action for consideration by the Board:

1- The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science proposal for "A New National Program of Library and Information Service" should be examined from the point of view of issues relating to the ordering and processing of materials in order that the Association may offer constructive suggestions in the interest of its members and the national library community.

2- ARL should continue to monitor and evaluate the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging to ensure that the scope and timeliness of the program is responsive to the needs of the scholarly community.

3- ARL should continue to participate in efforts to develop a national serials data base.

4- ARL should participate in efforts to promote the exchange of cataloging information in machine readable form and actively promote the development of a national union catalog of such information.

5- ARL should explore the advantages and disadvantages of closing card catalogs and determine the conditions and methods by which such action would be desirable.

6- ARL should define the optimal patterns for building library collections with specific reference to blanket ordering, approval plans, differential pricing to libraries and consortia, service charges, and related issues. It may be desirable to formulate a study of the economics of information transfer to evaluate the pricing structure of commercial publishing, reprinting, and charges to libraries in relation to cooperative efforts in collection development.

7- ARL should continue to explore the desirability of establishing national centers of excellence in selected fields and national resource centers, such as the periodical center concept, as alternative methods of ensuring a dependable method of bibliographic and physical access to scholarly resources. In relation to these concepts the determination of effective cost sharing of these resources is required to provide the incentive for libraries to assume national responsibility so that cost savings in acquisitions may be effected in cooperating libraries.

The Commission is aware that some of the foregoing proposals relate to the charge of other Commissions. The NPAC Committee is considered to be a standing committee and the other proposals may be accomplished by a task force approach with a specific charge and time limit for response. Some areas require a state-of-the-art investigation and other areas may require a sharper definition of the problems and identification of information needs.

We suggest that vigorous exploration of these issues will enable the Association to take the initiative in stating the needs of the scholarly community in explicit terms and in a more forceful manner. We suggest further that nothing constructive is likely to happen nationally unless and until this organization points the way.

William Budington
Joseph Treyz, Jr.
Stanley McElderry, Chairman

APPENDIX H

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACCESS TO RESOURCES

This Commission's major issues of concern and direction of approach continue to be consistent with those outlined in detail in the basic document of December 1971 (copy herewith);

... the Commissioners currently have feelings of urgency about the manner in which the Association can best be responsibly and effectively active in the area of interlibrary loans ... and, also, the broader realm of library-to-library services generally, such as networking (which overall subject has, as you know, been regarded by the Commission as something for its own close study and discussion, at this stage, without asking for the establishment of any committee or task force);

... aside from the interlibrary loan study committees, which are about to be dissolved as having completed their missions, the two committees which are now in existence to which the Commission bears a relationship (the Committee on Rare Books and Manuscripts, chaired by Ray Frantz, and the Committee on Data Bases, under the chairmanship of Gustave Harrer) should both at present be regarded as standing committees of the Association; and

... out of the January-seventeenth meeting, it is expected, will come a recommendation from the Commission to the Board on what action may be appropriate with respect to further committee or task-force attention to the field of interlibrary loan.

* * * *

Name: ARL Commission on Access to Resources

Charge: To assist research library users by improving access to information, through a concern for activity and programs of local, regional, national, or international application, and covering all types of library materials.

Function: To assess the adequacy and effectiveness of existing programs, policies, standards, and procedures; to determine means for improving, rationalizing, and advancing such adequacy or effectiveness; to report regularly to the Board of Directors, defining problems, identifying objectives and priorities, and recommending committee structure and assignments or other ARL action; and to accept from the Board responsibility for coordinating activities within its general area of responsibility.

Primary Concerns: The user of research libraries is faced with both increasingly complex circumstances of bibliographic organization of materials and the constantly enlarging inability of individual libraries to provide all of the resources the user may require. Access can therefore be frustrated by various conditions, such as:

1) User does not know what publication contains the information he desires.
2) User cannot rapidly search contents of unanalyzed sets and microtext programs.
3) User cannot easily find which nearby libraries contain a publication which is not available locally.
4) User cannot immediately determine which copies, within his own library system, are not presently in use and, thus, currently available to him.
5) User may require immediate response, whereas access systems usually respond lethargically.
6) User finds restrictive and irrational an absence of effective cross-reliance or effective interrelationship among public, special, governmental, and academic libraries of various sorts.
7) User cannot with adequate speed for his purposes work through a hierarchy of libraries in an interlibrary lending network.
8) User cannot readily locate, locally or regionally, a reference specialist best able to aid him in his particular needs.
9) User finds certain rules controlling access to be severely limiting to his research.

Some of the problems and considerations involved in the foregoing enumeration represent, of course, matters of direct concern to other ARL Commissions than that on Access to Resources alone, and there will be a decided need for both interplay and a high level of cooperation among the individual Commissions in addressing various and complex issues of importance regarding access and reader-service.

The Commission on Access to Resources cites three main headings, with several subunits each, representing some of the spheres within which special attention should be focussed in attempting to alleviate or ameliorate problems incident to user-library interface:

1) Categories of users, such as:
    a) faculty and students of local institution
    b) faculty and students enjoying reciprocal, inter-institutional library privileges
    c) visiting scholars
    d) other institutions
    e) business and industrial patrons
    f) reprint publishers

2) Kinds of resources, such as:
    a) rare books
    b) manuscripts
    c) out-of-print monographs
    d) serials
    e) government documents
    f) machine data files
    g) audio, video, and pictorial materials

3) Means of use, such as:
    a) direct access
    b) interlibrary loan
    c) photocopy service
    d) cable T.V.
    e) telefacsimile
    f) computer networking

The library interface with the system of libraries and other information agencies involves:

1) Administrative and organization relationships
2) Fiscal, funding, budgeting, contractual arrangements
3) Technical arrangements including systems standards, hardware, and communication lines

The Commission Approach: The Commission on Access to Resources presently selects the broad area of interface as deserving top priority for its attention. It tentatively has divided this field into six components:

1) Interlibrary loan (including photocopy in lieu of loan)

2) Access to manuscripts (including time and use limitations)
3) Access to large data banks
4) Access to auxiliary or deposit collections (including weeding and protocols of acceptance)
5) Interinstitutional reciprocity and service to external users (including direct access, guidelines for reasonableness of limitations, and use of contractual reliance, royalties, fees)
6) Library-to-Library services, i.e. networking
    a) management aspects: system organization, control of routing, legal issues, cost/fee issues
    b) delivery systems: communication devices such as TWX, telefacsimile, cable T.V., communication satellites

The Commission on Access to Resources does not believe one of these must be resolved before another is started, except that part 5 and part 6 should encompass the first four. Part 5 may treat arrangements of a lower sophistication than part 6; networking may involve multi-type of libraries and an enhanced delivery system.

Preliminary work can be done on the first four parts; however, a master plan should evolve from further consideration of parts 5 and 6. To this the Commission on Access to Resources will next address itself.

Note: Since national resource pools may be created in furtherance of achieving adequacy of resources available to scholars, the Commission on Access to Resources regards this as the province of the Commission on the Development of Resources, and so it excludes this from part 4 above. Part 4 thus deals only with access to existing collections, segregated materials, material on deteriorating paper, lesser-used collections, and supplementary collections not commonly needed in many local institutions.

David C. Weber
Rutherford D. Rogers
Edward Connery Lathem, Chairman

December 1971

APPENDIX S

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON MANAGEMENT

This statement identifies topics that have, during recent years, been identified by the Commission as being especially pertinent to research library management. Some of them are now being addressed by the Office of University Library Management Studies; others might be the focus of future OMS projects or of other ARL action subsequent to Board review and direction. Following the Program Review is a brief survey of Commission responsibilities and related matters.

I. Program Review

1. Management processes and practices

The Management Review and Analysis Program developed by OMS and now in its second year of application has proved to be an effective way to assist individual libraries interested in improving their operations. It is anticipated that there will be enough ARL libraries interested in participating in the MRAP program to justify continuation in the present form for at least two more years.

There is also evidence that some non-ARL libraries would welcome an opportunity to participate in MRAP. It is the opinion of both the Commission and the OMS Director that it would be appropriate to admit selected non-ARL libraries to MRAP groups providing (a) a place is available and (b) a fee is paid. If the Board concurs, a fee of $1,500 in addition to the cost of materials (presently $400) is suggested. Discussions at ACRL and elsewhere are also underway with the object of transferring some of the benefits of the MRAP experience to collegiate libraries. The Commission supports OMS participation in these discussions to provide advice and possibly guidance, but it seems important that OMS not become involved in a central or operating role which might jeopardize ARL programs and overtax the staff.

There has been some discussion with OMS staff about development of a brief and uncomplicated guide that libraries might use by themselves for a variety of purposes, including evaluation of changes made as a result of MRAP participation and assessment of performance by prospective MRAP participants. A "management status" review process of the type envisioned might in fact be of continuing utility to many libraries.

Finally, planning for research libraries working as a group to accomplish collective goals is still a valid topic for Commission attention, but as yet no effective way to address the subject has been found.

2. Information sharing

In recent years many libraries have developed management systems and procedures of great sophistication and their documentation is important and of potential interest to many ARL members. It was the need to gather, organize, and synthesize this material that prompted creation of the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC). In only a few months SPEC has proved its value, and its success has created both external interest and substantial new demands on OMS staff.

In order to establish some control on the kind and cost of services rendered and, at the same time, to make SPEC files available to more libraries, the Commission proposes the following guidelines.

(a) Access to SPEC resources will continue to be free to members. This access can be gained via direct visits to the OMS, brief telephone informational inquiries, or requests for specific documents (loaned for short periods or copied at a cost);

(b) Auxiliary services that utilize SPEC resources will be made available at cost to members. These services include: detailed response to individual problems, file analysis, SPEC KITS, etc.;

(c) Access to SPEC resources for non-members should be on an annual subscription rate basis, possibly $50 per year. This would entitle non-members to receive all of the OMS publications as well as the access privileges given free to members;

(d) Direct access to SPEC resources for students and researchers would be free as long as the Office is able to accommodate such visitors.

(e) SPEC KITS would be offered to non-members on a cost-plus basis (i.e., if ARL members are charged $5, non-members would be charged $10);

(f) Initially, consultation-like services utilizing SPEC files should not be offered.

3. Library personnel

By participating in OMS programs, many ARL library staff members have had an opportunity to develop new skills and insights into the management process. But it seems probable that additional work on methods of personnel training, analysis of staff composition, and even in prescription for professional education will be required. An early prospect is development of self-contained training programs in specific management areas that could be employed within ARL libraries as part of a staff development program. The information contained in such programs can perhaps be drawn from the MRAP activity. OMS is also considering a project to assess existing training material with the possibility that a collection of the best films, training courses, etc. might be developed in the Office for use of members. More difficult to accomplish is the more demanding kind of investigation that would provide further insights into the skills and perceptions required if library staffs are to accomplish well the full range of research library service obligations. It is not clear how deeply the Office can or should go into this and related areas of library education, but ARL's interest in the general topic is substantial.

4. Information about libraries

From almost the beginning of Commission and OMS activity, the need to improve both the quality and utility of quantitative data about libraries has been clear. Because much of such data is assembled for diverse uses (e.g., for reports to parent institutions, for state and federal governments, for analytical purposes, etc.) it is difficult for ARL to assume a dominant role in specifying what and how data should be collected. Still, the subject is an important one and needs attention. Several steps for OMS are suggested.

(a) Assess information currently gathered and distributed by ARL with the goals of improving comparability and utility.

(b) Consider contracting for analytical studies that would further explore financial questions related to library operations, especially the links between library expenditures and library performance. NSF will commit substantial research support funds to this general area during the years immediately ahead.

(c) A related topic of potential interest is a projected OMS survey of present data in ARL libraries. Depending on findings, products of the survey might include case studies of how data is used in such management processes as resource allocation, budget presentation, and long-range planning.

II. Commission Responsibilities

1. Committees

(a) Committee on ARL Statistics

The work of this Committee has been focused on defining terms used in the ARL statistics, with special attention to implementing the new criteria for ARL membership. It is our understanding that the work of this Committee is essentially completed, and it is recommended that the members be thanked and the Committee be discharged. It is anticipated that any future OMS work on the topic will draw on one or more task forces established for the purpose.

(b) Joint ARL/ACRL Committee on University Library Standards

After a substantial period of inaction, a meeting is scheduled for Mid-winter. It is recommended that the Board advise the Chairman that ARL will continue participation until January, 1975 when the work of the Committee will be reviewed. Unless progress towards drafting standards is real and substantial at the 1975 review, it is recommended that ARL terminate participation at that time.

(c) Standards Committee (Z-39)

Eugene Kennedy is ARL representative to Z-39, and continuation is recommended.

(d) ARL/ACE Committee on University Library Management

With publication of the Booz, Allen, and Hamilton report, the members have been thanked for their help and the Committee disbanded. The Commission would underscore the continuing importance of maintaining ARL/ACE ties.

2. The Office of University Library Management Studies

The performance of the Director and staff of OMS has been marked by imagination, skill, and energy with substantial benefits to ARL and its member libraries. Assuming CLR financial capabilities, funding for the Office is assured through October, 1975. However, the Board needs to begin planning now for the future of OMS, because the program, staff, and momentum of the Office will all be jeopardized if the lead time for future funding is cut too close. The Commission is convinced that continuation of the Office as an integral part of ARL operations is and will continue to be important to the Association on into the future.

3. The Commission

It is recommended that Dick De Gennaro be designated Chairman of the Commission, and that an effort be made to identify another member of the ARL Board to replace Ben Bowman whose term expires in January, 1974. Jim Haas will continue as a member of the Commission until January, 1975, when his term expires. At present, a Commission of three members seems adequate.

Ben Bowman
Richard De Gennaro
Warren Haas, Chairman

APPENDIX J

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

From the outset this Commission has functioned more as a committee than as a commission. It has tended to deal directly with targets of opportunity in the area of its responsibility and concern. In part this is because the Federal Relations Committee, the principal committee within the purview of the Commission, has been without a chairman, thus work that would normally concern the Committee has instead been shared by the Commission and the ARL staff. Moreover, because the Chairman of the Commission has also been a member of the ARL Executive Committee the Commission has tended to pattern its activities after the Executive Committee and to function more as an operating body than as a coordinating and monitoring agency. That this situation exists is not to say that it is desirable. Very probably changes are in order and certainly they are in prospect if suggestions made at the November 19 meeting of the ARL Officers, Commission chairman and staff are adopted.

It is interesting to note that the initial charge to this Commission as put forth in the Buckman proposal of March 29, 1971 assigns rather direct responsibilities to this Commission. The exact language is, "To study the legislative, administrative and judicial policies and trends within the Federal government as they may relate to the interests and objectives of research libraries; and to bring these interests and objectives to the attention of the Congress, Federal agencies and persons representing them in ways which will engage their support of the national community of research libraries serving higher education, government and society at large." The statement goes on to observe that the Commission will ordinarily be concerned with broad issues and programs of interest to all of the other commissions. This is all the more reason why the Commission's activities have been nearly inseparable from those of the Executive Committee and the staff.

The original Buckman charge to this Commission confined itself to the relationship between the ARL and the Federal government. The present name of the Commission recognizes the fact that the ARL has many other external relationships of great importance: with educational and professional groups, with foundations and funding agencies, and even occasionally with foreign governments and international organizations. Inevitably, many of the routine aspects of these relationships have been handled by the Executive Director and his staff since the ARL office is so often the initial point of contact for other organizations. On the other hand, where the relationship has been an important or a promising one the staff has been quick to seek the involvement of the membership through the appropriate channel of the Commission on External Affairs. Thus the Commission has been involved over time in discussions with officers of the American Council on Education, the Council on Library Resources, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the National Commission on the Financing of Post-secondary Education; and many other agencies governmental and non-governmental.

Activities of these kinds seem to be entirely consistent with the Statement of ARL Mission and Objectives, in particular continuing objectives 2 and 3 which state that the ARL "seeks the understanding and support of governmental agencies and other appropriate organizations," and "cooperates with other educational and professional groups in undertakings of mutual interest." In actual practice the Commission on External Affairs has gone about meeting the requirements of these objectives largely in response to initiatives arising outside the ARL. If any change in the role of the Commission is indicated that change should probably be in the direction of a more aggressive effort to develop initiatives from within the ARL, together with an improved method for communicating ARL positions to others.

Such a change will not come easily. First, it will require the identification of issues of major concern to the Association. (Many of these issues are already known as a result of the work of the other ARL Commissions.) Second, it will require the ordering of priorities for dealing with these issues. (This could be a task for joint meetings of officers, staff and commission chairmen.) Third, it will require the preparation and "ratification" of statements reflecting the ARL position on these issues. (If two meetings a year are not sufficient for the purpose additional ways must be found for reaching the membership.) Last, as has been said earlier, it will require more effective means of communicating persuasively with those who have the power to translate the wishes of the Association into tangible support.

In many respects the long-range concerns of this Commission are inseparable from the long-range concerns of the Association itself. This Commission must pattern its activities to the major objectives of the Association. With the staff and officers it can be at the cutting edge of any effort to secure a firm base for the collective activities of research libraries. The long-range goal may well be to work toward a public corporation which is at one and the same time protective of the combined resources of the membership and yet inventive in regard to access to information.

Meanwhile short-range concerns may be expected to be similar to those which have occupied the Commission to date. Typical of these tasks is the responsibility recently assigned to this Commission to prepare a response representing the official ARL reaction to the draft plan of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science entitled, "A New National Program of Library and Information Service."

Other opportunities will doubtless arise. If the proposed White House Conference on Libraries should be approved this Commission would have an obvious responsibility to assist in determining the ARL role in the Conference. In the end, however, the value and effectiveness of the Commission on External Affairs will be determined by the plans and programs devised by other commissions and committees, accorded a high priority by the ARL Board, and given strong support by the membership. With such programs in hand and with a reasonable investment of energy, enthusiasm and imagination, the Commission on External Affairs should be able to win greater understanding and support for the purposes of the Association.

John McDonald, Chairman

APPENDIX K

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

REPORT ON FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(with supplemental material)

TWO YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1973

CONTENTS

Page

Auditors' Report 3- 4

Financial Statements:

Statement of assets and liabilities 5

Statement of receipts and disbursements:

General operating fund 6
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency fund 7
Center for Chinese Research Materials revolving fund 8
Statement of fund balances 9
Notes to financial statements 10

Supplemental material: 11
General operating fund - schedule of disbursements 12
Special program funds - schedule of receipts and disbursements 13
Proof of cash 14

SEIDMAN & SEIDMAN
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
OFFICES THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES
INTERNATIONALLY · THORNE BINDER SEIDMAN & CO

January 10, 1974

Board of Directors
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D. C.

We have examined the statement of assets and liabilities of the Association of Research Libraries as of December 31, 1973 and 1972, and the related statements of receipts and disbursements and fund balances of the general operating fund and special program funds for the years then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

The financial statements of the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project were examined by other auditors whose reports have been furnished to us. Our opinion, insofar as it relates to the amounts included for this project, is based solely upon the reports of the other auditors.

These statements have been prepared on the cash receipts and disbursements basis, and, as a result, omit material assets and liabilities. Accordingly, they do not, in our opinion, present financial position and results of operations as they would had generally accepted accrual basis accounting principles been applied in their preparation.

In our opinion, the accompanying statements present fairly the assets and liabilities of the Association of Research Libraries at December 31, 1973 and 1972, arising from cash transactions, and the recorded cash receipts and disbursements and changes in fund balances of the Association during the year then ended, on a consistent basis.

Seidman & Seidman

Certified Public Accountants

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

	December 31, 1973	December 31, 1972 (Restated)
ASSETS		
Cash in bank and on hand	$ 25 920	$ 44 183
Cash in savings account	40 958	14 141
Cash held by others - agency fund	109 277	97 813
Savings certificate	238 385	224 018
Deposits	487	485
	$415 027	$380 640
LIABILITIES		
Payroll taxes withheld	$ 1 994	$ 3 987
Special program funds for which the Association is accountable to the grantors	30 089	63 915
Total liabilities	32 083	67 902
FUND BALANCES		
General operating fund	121 246	114 734
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency fund	109 277	97 813
Center for Chinese Research Materials revolving fund	152 421	100 191
Total fund balances	382 944	312 738
	$415 027	$380 640

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

GENERAL OPERATING FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1973	Year ended December 31, 1972
RECEIPTS:		
Dues	$142 000	$132 000
Publications	5 655	6 566
Royalties	1 288	435
Interest	18 184	16 034
Miscellaneous	60	9
Total receipts	167 187	155 044
DISBURSEMENTS	181 394	198 368
Less administrative expenses charged to special program funds	20 719	33 106
Net disbursements	160 675	165 262
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER DISBURSEMENTS	$ 6 512	$(10 218)

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM PROJECT AGENCY FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31,	
	1973	1972
RECEIPTS:		
Dues	$ 74 375	$ 69 526
Sales to members and non-members	90 247	44 681
Interest	800	525
Totals	165 422	114 732
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Audit	600	600
Insurance	618	1 250
Miscellaneous	102	462
Newspapers and microfilm	51 079	45 304
Payroll taxes	2 026	1 479
Purchases for members and non-members	72 531	40 338
Royalties	1 746	1 742
Salaries	23 799	22 357
Storage	280	280
Supplies	1 177	1 725
Totals	153 958	115 537
EXCESS OF DISBURSEMENTS OVER RECEIPTS	$ 11 464	$ (805)

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CENTER FOR CHINESE RESEARCH MATERIALS REVOLVING FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1973	Year ended December 31, 1972 (Restated)
RECEIPTS:		
Sale of publications	$124 992	$113 907
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Cost of publications	71 040	63 723
Transfer to Chinese Center operations	3 563	-
	74 603	63 723
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER DISBURSEMENTS	$ 50 389	$ 50 184

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

STATEMENT OF FUND BALANCES

	Year ended December 31,	
	1973	1972
GENERAL OPERATING FUND:		
BALANCE, at beginning of year	$114 734	$127 786
LESS - correction of prior year receipts from sale of publications		2 834
ADJUSTED BALANCE, at beginning of year	114 734	124 952
ADD - excess of receipts over disbursements	6 512	(10 218)
BALANCE, at end of year	$121 246	$114 734

	1973	1972
FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM PROJECT AGENCY FUND:		
BALANCE, at beginning of year	$ 97 813	$ 98 618
ADD - excess of receipts over disbursements	11 464	(805)
BALANCE, at end of year	$109 277	$ 97 813

	1973	1972 (Restated)
CENTER FOR CHINESE RESEARCH MATERIALS REVOLVING FUND:		
BALANCE, at beginning of year	$100 191	$ -0-
ADD - amount transferred from liability account	1 841	50 007
- excess of receipts over disbursements	50 389	50 184
BALANCE, at end of year	$152 421	$100 191

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1973

ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES FOLLOWED:

The Association charges expenditures for office equipment in full to current operations and shows no equipment in its accounts.

RESTATEMENT AND PRIOR YEAR ADJUSTMENTS:

The financial statements for December 31, 1972 and for the year then ended as presented herein have been restated in order to reflect a transfer of the revolving fund of the Center for Chinese Research Material in the amount of $50,007 from liability to equity as at January 1, 1972. Also, the statements reflect a reclassification in the amount of $2,834 for 1972 Center for Chinese Research Materials publication sales previously recorded as Association receipts.

INCOME TAXES:

The absence of a provision for income taxes is due to the Association's exemption from federal income tax under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Our examination of the financial statements included in the preceding section of this report was directed to an expression of our opinion on those statements taken as a whole. The supplemental material presented in the following section of this report has been subjected to certain audit procedures applied in connection with our examination of the financial statements. This information, while not considered necessary for the fair presentation of the statements of assets and liabilities and receipts and disbursements of the Association, is, in our opinion, fairly stated in all material respects when considered in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

Seidman & Seidman

Washington, D. C.
January 10, 1974

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

GENERAL OPERATING FUND
SCHEDULE OF DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31,	
	1973	1972
Board and committee expenses	$ 6 925	$ 8 744
Conference expense	7 876	7 336
Dues	1 825	956
Equipment purchases	845	219
Honorarium	500	-
Hospitalization	1 611	1 626
Insurance and bonding	3 252	3 110
Miscellaneous	728	568
Payroll taxes	3 699	3 283
Periodicals and subscriptions	1 435	711
Printing	9 321	7 807
Professional fees	11 416	37 592
Postage and freight	2 214	2 878
Rent	7 119	6 455
Retirement plan	8 025	10 860
Salaries	89 053	90 341
Staff travel and expenses	6 574	3 106
Stationery and supplies	5 627	8 942
Telephone	3 349	3 834
Funding for special programs - University Library Management Study Office	10 000	-
Totals	$181 394	$198 368

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

SPECIAL PROGRAM FUNDS
SCHEDULE OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1973		
	Center for Chinese Research Materials	Inter-Library Loans (N.S.F.)	Brasenose II Conference
RECEIPTS:			
Grants	$103 878	$130 000	$ -
Sale of publications			
Transfer from CCRM revolving fund	3 563		
Transfer from ARL general fund	-		
Totals	107 441	130 000	-
DISBURSEMENTS:			
Allocated administrative expenses	9 489	2 755	
Consulting fees			
Contractor fees		151 224	
Cost of publications			
Employee benefits	8 416	810	
Equipment purchases	202		
Miscellaneous	217	550	
Office expenses	3 971		
Payroll taxes	3 933		
Periodicals and subscriptions	328		
Postage	384		
Printing	2 401		
Rent and storage	6 804		
Salaries and investigator fees	64 052	5 590	
Telephone	801		
Training			
Travel	4 671	4 613	169
Totals	105 669	165 542	169
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER DISBURSEMENTS	1 772	(35 542)	(169)
FUND BALANCE - BEGINNING (RESTATED)	1 787	42 248	3 917
	3 559	6 706	3 748
LESS: Repayment to grantor	-	-	-
Transfer to equity account	1 841		
	1 841	-	-
FUND BALANCE - END	$ 1 718	$ 6 706	$3 748

Year ended December 31, 1973				
Inter-Library Loan Survey	University Library Management Study Office	I.F.L.A. 1974 Convention	Total	Year ended December 31, 1972 Total (Restated)
$15 000	$66 000	$19 500	$334 378	$284 239
	3 318		3 318	1 477
	-		3 563	
	10 000		10 000	-
15 000	79 318	19 500	351 259	285 716
3 475	5 000		20 719	33 106
787	2 719		3 506	5 447
			151 224	6 302
				4 379
	6 392		15 618	16 049
	1 254		1 456	657
	957		1 724	486
173	6 719		10 863	10 366
	2 273		6 206	4 487
	663		991	992
	1 470		1 854	3 015
712	11 803		14 916	7 983
	3 388		10 192	10 837
7 349	42 750		119 741	128 121
	3 156		3 957	3 526
	5 308		5 308	824
1 018	4 498		14 969	20 660
13 514	98 350	-	383 244	257 237
1 486	(19 032)	19 500	(31 985)	28 479
(1 486)	17 449	-0-	63 915	130 850
-0-	(1 583)	19 500	31 930	159 329
-	-	-	-	45 407
			1 841	50 007
-	-	-	1 841	95 414
$ -0-	$(1 583)	$19 500	$ 30 089	$ 63 915

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

PROOF OF CASH
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1973

CASH BALANCE - BEGINNING		$380 640
ADD: Excess of receipts over disbursements:		
Special program funds for which the Association is accountable to the grantors	(31 985)	
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project agency fund	11 464	
ARL general operating fund	6 512	
Center for Chinese Research Materials revolving fund	50 389	36 380
Payroll taxes fourth quarter 1973 paid January, 1974		1 994
		419 014
LESS: Payroll taxes fourth quarter 1972 paid January, 1973		3 987
CASH BALANCE - ENDING		$415 027

APPENDIX L

Center for Chinese Research Materials

Annual Report for the Year 1973

by P. K. Yu

On September 1, 1973 the ARL Center for Chinese Research Materials entered its third funding period. The new two-year grant was awarded by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) in an amount of $220,000, with the Ford Foundation having donated half of the grant amount to the NEH.

The first grant was awarded by the Ford Foundation in an amount of $500,000. The ARL Chinese Center began to operate in May 1968. A second grant in an amount of $124,332 for the period July 1972 through August 1973 was awarded by the NEH through its gift and matching grant program in continued support of the Center's operation.

During these five years and seven months the Center has been administered by the Association of Research Libraries, and in particular by its Executive Director, Dr. Stephen A. McCarthy, and guided in its activities by an advisory committee, which at present has as members Philip J. McNiff (Boston Public Library), who has chaired the committee from its inception, Edwin G. Beal, Jr. (Orientalia Division, Library of Congress), Roy M. Hofheinz, Jr. (Harvard University), Ying-mao Kau (Brown University), David T. Roy (University of Chicago), and Eugene Wu (Harvard-Yenching Library, Harvard University).

In 1973 the Center published three issues of the Newsletter, Nos. 12, 13 and 14, which announced a total of 283 new titles of Chinese research materials at a list price of $3,937.05. This compares with 578 titles at a list price of $21,785.20 made available from 1968 to the end of 1972. The aggregate figures and the classification of these titles are as follows:

Category	No. of Titles Announced 1968-1972	1973	Total No. of Titles	Total List Price
Newspapers	9	2	11	$ 4,461.50
Periodicals	44	5	49	4,939.40
Government Publications	44	18	62	5,127.00
Research Aids	50	26	76	4,354.40
Monographs	431	206	637	6,657.15
Literature	-	26	26	182.80
Total:	578	283	861	$25,722.25

Of the 283 new titles brought out during 1973, the following major titles, because of their scholarly value in support of Chinese studies and research, deserve special mention:

1. A Chronology of Twentieth-Century China, 1904-1949
   Washington, D. C., ARL Chinese Center, 1972.
   3,772 pages in 6 volumes.
   The compilation of this work was suggested by Professor Albert Feuerwerker, University of Michigan, who is the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Contemporary China, of the ACLS and the SSRC.

2. National Bibliography
   Peking. Nos. 1, 3, and 4 of 1972, 51p., 61p., and 92p.
   Nos. 1-6, 1973, xviii+250p.

3. Red Guard Publications (RG-10 and RG-11)
   Microfilm - three reels; microfilm - two reels.
   The previous nine groups were released to the Center for reproduction by the U.S. State Department, but the materials included in these two groups were loaned to the Center by a foreign observer who was in Peking for the duration of the Cultural Revolution.

4. A Bibliography of Novels, Literature on the PLA, and Literary Writings by the PLA, 1949-1959
   Washington, D.C., ARL Chinese Center, 1973. 15p.

5. Collection of Agricultural Information on Mainland China
   Hong Kong, U.S. Agricultural Attaché's Office, 1967.
   Microfilm in 55 reels.

In addition to the aforementioned titles, the ARL Chinese Center, in cooperation with the University of California at Berkeley, reproduced twenty-six titles of new Chinese literature, originally published between 1951 and 1966.

Another 168 titles were reproductions of materials published in the People's Republic of China between 1966 and 1972. These publications were brought back by American scholars, including Professor John K. Fairbank, of Harvard University, from their respective visits to China.

In 1973 the ARL Chinese Center also reproduced eleven provincial government gazettes of the Republican period on 132 reels of microfilm.

Sales of publications for the year 1973 were $127,405.95, comparing with $94,286.67 for the year 1972. Thus, total sales through December 1973 amounted to $431.320.18, comparing with $303,914.23 and $209,627.56 at the end of 1972 and 1971 respectively. Listed below are those customers which placed orders for the Center's materials totaling in excess of $2,000:

DOMESTIC

1.	Center for Research Libraries	$19,010.00
2.	University of Michigan	18,203.98
3.	Princeton University	16,864.15
4.	The Library of Congress	16,410.90
5.	University of Chicago	15,280.85
6.	Harvard-Yenching Library, Harvard University	14,008.00
7.	University of Pittsburgh	12,582.15
8.	Cornell University	11,212.35
9.	University of Washington, Seattle	9,631.80
10.	Yale University	7,300.95
11.	University of California - Los Angeles	7,200.50
12.	University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	5,844.45
13.	The Hoover Institution	5,810.65
14.	Columbia University	5,570.75
15.	University of Virginia	5,135.50
16.	University of Maryland	5,128.96
17.	University of California - Santa Barbara	4,154.15
18.	University of Hawaii	4,024.65
19.	University of Minnesota	3,948.75
20.	Brown University	3,757.20
21.	University of California - Berkeley	3,729.05
22.	University of Kansas	3,620.40
23.	San Diego State College	3,493.80
24.	University of Arizona	3,482.40
25.	Ohio State University	3,359.40
26.	Rutgers University	3,357.50
27.	University of Wisconsin	2,945.55
28.	University of North Carolina	2,854.55
29.	University of Pennsylvania	2,353.75
30.	University of Miami	2,300.75
31.	George Washington University	2,139.50
32.	Duke University	2,066.06

FOREIGN

1.	National Library of Australia	$16,792.80
2.	Yushodo Booksellers, Ltd., Tokyo	11,951.51
3.	University of Toronto	11,663.35
4.	University of British Columbia, Vancouver	9,128.00
5.	Chinese University of Hong Kong	9,026.80
6.	The Center for Modern Chinese Studies, The Toyo Bunko, Tokyo	8,939.95
7.	Australian National University	8,720.60
8.	To Ho Sho Ten Co., Ltd., Tokyo	8,263.47
9.	Sinologisch Instituut, Leiden, Holland	6,107.18
10.	Institut für Asienkunde, Hamburg, Germany	5,799.00
11.	University of Leeds, England	5,181.80
12.	School of Oriental and African Studies, London	5,076.04
13.	The Royal Library, Copenhagen, Denmark	5,060.30
14.	University of Hong Kong	4,891.25
15.	Freie Universität Berlin, Germany	4,569.75
16.	Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica, Taiwan	4,234.80
17.	Publishers International Corp., Tokyo	3,781.59
18.	Far Eastern Booksellers, Tokyo	3,772.10
19.	Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan	3,723.50
20.	University of Alberta, Canada	3,503.95
21.	Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany	3,464.50
22.	McGill University, Montreal	2,691.85
23.	Centre Chine - Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris	2,248.85

Following the guidelines set by the advisory committee to the ARL Chinese Center, the director participated in a number of academic and library conferences, and visited libraries and university centers.

The purpose of these activities was to keep the Center informed of the needs of librarians and scholars with respect to Chinese research materials, to solicit their suggestions, and to collect materials for reproduction.

He attended the 25th Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies, held in Chicago last March, and presented a paper entitled "Bibliographic Control in the People's Republic of China, 1949-1972."

He also attended the 29th International Congress of Orientalists, which was held in Paris last July. In August he attended the 39th Session of the International Federation of Library Associations, held in Grenoble France, as a delegate of the Association of Research Libraries. Since the theme of this meeting was "Universal Bibliographic Control," he again presented the paper which he had delivered at the AAS meeting in Chicago.

While in Europe, he was also able to visit a number of research libraries and institutions in various European countries, including the State Library in East Berlin, to establish contact with scholars doing research in Chinese studies, and to identify sources of Chinese research materials which may be made available through the Center.

In December the director participated in the "Third Sino-American Conference on Mainland China," which was held in Taipei, Taiwan, and also visited various libraries and institutions in that country and in Japan and Hong Kong.

Because of budgetary reasons, a position of bibliographer, vacated in March 1973, remained unfilled. Thus, the staff of the Center, in addition to the director, now consists of an administrative secretary and associate editor, a bibliographer, an assistant bibliographer, and a clerk.

During the past year, the Center received strong support from its advisory committee and from the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Contemporary China in its efforts to obtain further funding from the Ford Foundation and from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Written support was also received from the directors of university libraries, and from the directors of the Asian centers of Harvard University, Columbia University, Michigan University, and the University of California at Berkeley. This clearly demonstrates that the work of the Center has resulted in an important contribution to their programs of Chinese studies and research. We are confident that during the next two years the Center will make many more contributions.

Washington, D.C.
January 8, 1974

APPENDIX M

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES

Third Annual Report: December, 1973

The impact of the Association's efforts to improve the management of research libraries was demonstrated in this past year by widespread activity of member libraries in the management arena and by direct involvement of most member libraries in one or more Office projects.

The third year of operation for the Office produced a new Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, numerous management publications, and increased direct involvement of member libraries in the Management Review and Analysis Program. These extensions of programs and activities were facilitated by the addition of Jeffrey Gardner to the Office staff and by the continued support of the Office by the ARL membership. A three-year grant from the Council on Library Resources was awarded to the Association to finance operation of the Office to October 1975.

As noted in previous annual reports, the management effort of the Association began by addressing the research library's need for increased management expertise and providing assistance to individual libraries engaged in improving their management methods. To do this, four basic programs are operated by the Office: (1) Research and Development; (2) Information Exchange; (3) Management Training; and (4) Consultation. Past annual reports of the Office have commented on objectives and accomplishments in each of these programs. This report will comment briefly on the major projects of the year.

1. The Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP)

The MRAP is an assisted self-study of management practices in research libraries. Participating libraries assume responsibility for the conduct and results of the study, while the Office provides assistance via an MRAP Manual, Training Sessions, on-site visits, access to Office files, and consultation. Participation in this Program is free to ARL members; libraries are expected to pay only for the costs of reproducing necessary copies of the Manual. While the Program requires a significant time and staff commitment by the library, results to date indicate that the investment produces worthwhile, short-term benefits with considerable long-term potential.

The MRAP moved into a fully-operational context during the year with a rewriting of the MRAP Manual, and the completion of a second test of the program involving six libraries using the revised Manual. A third group of libraries began the Program in October. To date, fourteen member libraries have worked with the Office on this Program: Iowa State, Purdue, Tennessee, Case Western Reserve, Connecticut, Boston, Washington, Smithsonian, Rutgers, Washington State, Missouri, Maryland, Library of Congress/Division of the

Blind and Physically Handicapped, and Rochester. Four ARL libraries have expressed interest in participating in a fourth MRAP group expected to begin the Program in May or September, 1974.

2. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC)

The Center was established this year as a device for collecting, organizing, and disseminating management documents produced by ARL member libraries. The initial surveys were conducted in August and September and the files established subsequently. To date, the Office has gathered documentation on objectives, organization patterns, and personnel practices. Office staff has analyzed the survey results and organized the material into files. This analysis and evaluation has produced: (1) SPEC *Flyers*, a periodic announcement service describing files and survey results; and (2) SPEC *Kits*, packages of documentation representing illustrative approaches to specific management areas (e.g., organization of the library personnel office, status of librarians, etc.).

Access to the SPEC resources is free for member libraries. SPEC liaison persons have been established in each ARL library to provide a contact point for SPEC data-gathering and access to files. Auxiliary services such as file analysis, detailed reference requests, or program design assistance is available at cost. Access to the SPEC resources for non-members will be possible at either an annual subscription rate or via individual purchase of SPEC *Flyers* and *Kits*.

Limited services have been offered to date, but these have resulted in over 75 requests for information and documentation. Membership willingness to contribute documentation and to subsequently use these materials has allowed the Office to consider future expansion of the files and services.

3. Office Publications

The main event of the year in this area was the publication of the Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. case study of the organization and staffing of the libraries of Columbia University. The report was published by Redgrave Information Resources Corporation and distributed to the membership in November. Simultaneous with the publication of the report, the Columbia Libraries has completed a detailed implementation study which demonstrates how the Booz, Allen & Hamilton recommendations are being acted upon. This follow-up report will be distributed to members in early 1974.

During the year, the Office initiated two new series of ARL management information services. The first is called the ARL *Management Supplement* and reviews current activities of academic libraries in specific management areas. Four *Supplements* were issued, covering: planning, budgeting, and management training. The second series is called the SPEC Flyer and is an announcement service reporting on Office surveys and available documentation. Three Flyers were issued during the year in the areas of library goals and objectives statements, personnel practices, and academic status of librarians.

4. Workshops and Training Activities

A number of Office activities are aimed at the development of library managers. These activities include both the Management Review and Analysis Program and the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. The importance of this activity has led the Office during this year to invest more of its resources in management development.

A series of Planning/Budget Officers' workshops were offered to members. These workshops included: a meeting at the Cornell University Libraries that explored the application of the AMA Planning Program at Cornell; a meeting at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems that employed some of the quantitative management tools developed by that Center in a modeling exercise; and a meeting at the Columbia University Libraries which discussed planning and implementation for organizational changes in large research libraries.

The opportunity to nominate management "interns" to work in the Office under a CLR fellowship was extended to ARL members. Syracuse University Libraries nominated Richard Dionne, who is currently at work on a study of the formulation and use of objectives in research libraries. Northwestern University Libraries and the Office have cooperated on a project proposal for next year involving the examination of performance appraisal techniques in research libraries.

5. Other Projects

As a way of developing a better understanding of the management problems and interests of member libraries, Office staff invest a part of their time in making on-site visits to individual libraries to meet staff and discuss issues. These visits are frequently related to on-going projects such as MRAP, workshops, or NASIC. During the year, twenty-five libraries were visited and since the inception of the Office, over a third of the member libraries have been contacted in this fashion.

The Office is participating in a National Science Foundation-funded project called Northeast Academic Science Information Center (NASIC). This project is an attempt to develop a cooperative mechanism for the provision of machine-readable data base information services to academic libraries in the Northeast. Office staff are contributing consultative assistance from the point of view of the administration and use of data base services in research libraries. The project was funded during the year and completed a survey of existing data base activities. This project is administered by the New England Board of Higher Education.

The Office is also serving in an advisory capacity for a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science project that is developing recommendations for a nationwide program for continuing education. This project, conducted by Catholic University's Library Science Department, intends to explore improved approaches to meeting the training and developmental needs of library staff.

During this year, for the first time, ARL membership dues were used to finance a part of Office operating expenditures. As part of the CLR grant conditions, this direct financial support will increase over the remainder of the funding period. During that time, it is expected that the Office will have developed and will be operating a series of management services that meet member libraries' needs. To achieve that objective, we solicit individual comments on effectiveness of present programs and suggestions for future activities.

The Office continues to benefit greatly from the advice and guidance of the ARL Commission on the Management of Libraries (Warren J. Haas, Chairman; Ben Bowman; and Richard De Gennaro).

Submitted by:	Approved by:
Duane E. Webster, Director Office of University Library Management Studies	Stephen A. McCarthy Executive Director Association of Research Libraries

Interim Assessment of the Impact of the Management Review and Analysis Program

Summary of Progress to Date

The Management Review and Analysis Program was conceived and developed by the Office of University Library Management Studies during the period October, 1971--May, 1972. A group of three libraries (Iowa State University, Purdue University, and the University of Tennessee) participated in a pilot test of the Program which began in August, 1972. These three libraries completed the final phase of the Program in May, 1973, and all three have completed their final reports. The libraries are developing plans for implementation of the recommendations resulting from the Program.

A second group of six libraries (University of Washington, Rutgers State University, Case Western Reserve University, University of Connecticut, Boston University, and Smithsonian Institution) began the Program in May, 1973, and is currently preparing final reports. These libraries utilized a completely revised Manual and expanded Office Training Sessions. In addition, each Study Team in this second group is developing broad strategies for implementation of the recommendations resulting from their review and analysis.

A third group of five libraries (Washington State University, University of Rochester, University of Missouri, University of Maryland, Library of Congress/Division of the Blind and Physically Handicapped) began the Program in November of 1973, and a fourth group has formed to begin the Program in May or October of 1974.

A description of how the Program actually operates is provided by a paper scheduled to be published in the March issue of College and Research Libraries.

Impact of the MRAP

While the success of the MRAP Program in effecting change and improvement in the management of research libraries must be judged on a continuing, long-term basis, it is appropriate to consider some aspects relating to the impact of the Program to date.

Since the Program began in August, 1972, fourteen libraries and at least 750 library staff members have been directly involved in the MRAP. This involvement means that the participating library makes a conscientious attempt to apply the MRAP review and analysis procedures to its own requirements over a seven-month period. The staff time required to do this has been conservatively estimated at 35% of the Study Team Chairperson's time, 20% of the Study Team members' time, and 10% of the Task Force members' time. In addition, the Director, his top administrators, and the general staff are involved at various points in the project. Detailed time records kept for the Study Teams and Task Forces in MRAP/II indicate that this averages about 200 manhours per month per library.

As demonstrated at the two public presentations made by pilot library participants (ARL meeting, January, 1973, in Washington, D. C. and ARL meeting, May, 1973, in New Orleans) and the Training Sessions of MRAP, the Program has captured the interest and imagination of all staff involved in its completion. We have not systematically measured the nature of this participation or the amount of interest, but extensive feedback indicates that almost all staff are supportive. More important, the attitudes of staff concerning the need for change and improvement appears constructive. All are thinking about their work, relationships within the library, the concerns of management, and the application of developments in management science to their libraries. Few events have involved so many library staff so directly and yet still commanded their support and approval.

In addition to this general view of the impact of the MRAP, the success of participants in achieving the specific goals of the MRAP should be considered. The following goals represent the primary intents of the MRAP Program.

GOAL ONE: To creat an open problem-solving climate

While problem-solving has occurred at these libraries in the past, in the context of the MRAP Program this process has systematically examined a wide range of management concerns at a depth and with a thoroughness that may not have been possible previously. Furthermore, this problem-solving has involved more staff members in a more focused and concentrated fashion than before. More people are more aware of a wider range of concerns than before the Study. Part of this is getting staff to think in new terms of problems outside of their immediate work unit and with a view toward determining feasible solutions. This results in a positive atmosphere that recognizes constraints as well as opportunities. For example, a supervisor at one of the participating libraries was quoted as saying that MRAP had taken the carping out of the corridors and focused staff on seeking solutions.

GOAL TWO: To develop group process skills

In the past, library staff have not often been called upon to perform in task and work-oriented groups. Some have experience in committees, but few have mastered many of the skills of group dynamics. This Program requires that effective teams operate with the following characteristics: mutual goals, dependency on each other to complete work, and the need to reach a collective decision. With these requirements, the groups soon master complex group dynamics skills such as: candid, effective communication; sharing of responsibility for output; maintaining of necessary group functions (e.g., initiation of ideas, summarizing, decision-making, moving to new topics, etc.); and focusing on tasks to be accomplished.

The Program provides considerable assistance in developing the group process, such as: employing the Study Team as the primary vehicle for the investigation; setting up small Task Forces (four-five persons) to perform specific, analytical work; suggesting group dynamics factors that should be considered; developing group-oriented work plans; and pointing out problems that can be anticipated and what can be done about them in this setting. Some of this assistance is provided in the MRAP Manual and some is provided via the six OMS Training Sessions. The result is that every MRAP Study Team and Task Force member takes away from the project a better understanding of how groups work, how individuals relate in group settings, and some techniques for improving these interpersonal and intergroup working relationships.

GOAL THREE: To secure a better understanding of management concepts and principles

The MRAP provides an excellent instructional setting. The Study Teams are faced with the difficult task of examining management practices and must produce a report that the entire staff will look at very closely. At the same time, the Team has a real opportunity to influence the future direction of the library. This responsibility, along with the time constraints present, places a certain pressure on participants. Within this setting, management concepts, tools, and terminology are provided as a way of helping them meet this challenge. Most participants have responded eagerly to these tools and successfully applied these concepts and principles to their requirements.

GOAL FOUR: To assess present management practices

The reports from MRAP/I and those produced thus far by participants in MRAP/II, have demonstrated that with the appropriate guidelines, library staff can objectively describe and evaluate the management practices of the library. While the process has not always been easy nor always exceptionally effective, it has proven to be useful, productive, and valuable as a way of increasing staff awareness and understanding. These assessments provide a mechanism for communicating at all levels -- staff provide input as a first step toward more meaningful interaction, with new ideas generated and new understandings secured. This is part of the MRAP process -- getting staff to act responsibly and professionally -- rather than simply critiquing without a recognition of constraints.

GOAL FIVE: To determine future actions for management improvement

Most libraries could make isolated recommendations without going through as elaborate a process as MRAP. What the Program has contributed, however, is: coverage of management concerns over a broad spectrum; assistance in equipping the staff to deal with changes; the ability to recognize gaps; the appreciation of the need for mechanisms for continuing review and analysis; and the need to get staff commitment to accomplish these improvements. Building staff receptiveness to change and a staff attitude that values improvement is by far the most distinctive accomplishment of the Program. While all of the recommendations may not be equally significant, they are recommendations that are understood and have the support of a large number of the staff. In the long run, this should lead to more substantive and far-reaching changes in the nature and operation of libraries than has been possible previously. One Study Team Chairperson commented that after a long period of relative stagnation, simply gearing up the staff to think on their own was a distinctive accomplishment, which allowed library management to start moving on more ambitious projects.

GOAL SIX: To develop staff management and analytical capabilities

Two observations can be made here: first, many participants have noted that the MRAP provides an unusual opportunity for identifying and assessing library staff with management potential. The Program is a testing ground that introduces ingredients such as: new concepts, elements of uncertainty, challenging problems, and pressure. Determining how these potential managers operate under these circumstances will aid in determining their future success as library managers.

The second observation that can be made here is that all participants have commented that this Program influences the management style of the library at all levels. Frequently, this is characterized as more consultative or participative, but perhaps the strongest reason is that the staff now have the skills needed to increase their self-direction, allowing more effective involvement in all aspects of the enterprise.

IMPACT OF MRAP BEYOND STATED GOALS

Obviously, from the number of libraries and librarians that have already participated or expect to participate in the Program, the MRAP is influencing the development of management skills and expertise within the profession. The interest in this self-study concept has generated some consideration of the potential for future application of the Program to other libraries different in purpose, size, and specialization. While recognizing that this may be possible and even necessary, several basic questions concerning the implications of the Program might be asked:

- Has the MRAP generated a more favorable view toward the library by the university community?

This is one of the major questions that a Director considers in deciding to participate in this Program, and there are a number of examples of impact that can be noted. One Study Team, for example, was able through an interview and follow-up notes to the Provost, to establish a statement of goals and objectives for the university that was not available previously. In addition, that Study Team recommended that the Library Director participate in the planning councils of the university.

At another participating institution, the study resulted in the university agreeing to a salary and classification change for the clerical staff. At another library, the activities of the Study Team during the environmental analysis led to library administrative staff participating directly in university planning sessions. Finally, at yet another library, top university administration asked for periodic progress reports, met with the entire Study Team, and participated directly in the discussion of several key organizational issues.

This array of examples suggests that university administrators are paying attention to the project. The Program provides a formal vehicle for key library staff other than directors to meet with university administrators. This process of bringing the library to the attention of university administrators is, hopefully, a sound first step toward influencing their view of the library performance, role, and contribution.

- Does application of MRAP reduce diversity in the libraries that participate?

Generally, we have found that each institution has approached the study somewhat differently. They have applied the procedures, philosophy, and intent of the Program to their own requirements. This has resulted in addressing issues of local importance and designing recommendations that are quite different from other libraries'.

It is reasonable to expect some degree of conformity in addressing issues, not necessarily in solutions. Since many of the basic problems are the same in each of these institutions, it is natural and appropriate that techniques for and approaches to solutions be similar. For example: the report formats are similar; the topics addressed are the same; and the terminology used is uniform. What is different are the resulting basic themes of the reports. These themes are broad grouping of issues and recommendations that receive emphasis in the Study Team's report. Some of these themes noted to date include: role of the library in the university; clarification anf formalization of the library's decision-making processes; and the management training of library supervisors. But these themes have been different in every library.

- Does the MRAP contribute to improved services and programs?

One of the basic assumptions of the Program is that the development of a library's management capabilities will lead to improved library performance in terms of services and programs. The MRAP, for example, examines the goals and objectives of the library, analyzes the changing environment of higher education, and assesses the implications of trends for library operation. In completing this work, the library staff are forced to look at the changing needs and requirements of the academic staff, interested in and able to improve services.

° Does the MRAP lead to improved staff/management relations?

In most instances, staff/management relations have been helped by an honest, candid examination of problems present. This occurs because of top management's initiative to participate and attempt to come to grips with these problems. It also occurs when the Study Team discovers some of the constraints and difficulties faced by management. One result is that the Study Team has to define problems and consider solutions. They, then, have to persuade the staff of the feasibility of their recommendations. This requires hard work, solid thinking, and effective resolution of difference of opinion. In this process, the gap between staff and management is frequently reduced. As a part of this process, the Program has used the Likert Profile of Organizational Characteristics to measure the difference in perspective between management and staff, and to suggest corrective action to reduce that gap.

In conclusion, the MRAP, as it has evolved into operational format, has demonstrated its value to participating libraries in two primary ways: identification of useful required changes in management practices; and preparation of library staffs to pursue an on-going self-renewal process. While the accomplishment of the MRAP goals raises questions concerning intended and unintended consequences, the stimulation of thinking and activity in these areas is needed and appropriate.

In the future, a more thorough examination of the impact of the MRAP on participating libraries is envisioned. This examination should be conducted after the libraries have had an opportunity to implement recommendations and work with results.

Program Participants as of December, 1973

Library	Director	Chairperson	Group
Boston University	John Laucus	Karl Bynoe	II
Case Western Reserve	James V. Jones	Charles Andrews	II
Library of Congress/ Division Blind & Physically Handicapped	F. Kurt Cylke	Mary Jack Wintle & Richard Evensen	III
University of Connecticut	John P. McDonald	Norman Stevens	II
Iowa State University	Warren Kuhn	Tim Brown	I
University of Maryland	Howard Rovelstad	Robert Pierson	III
University of Missouri	Dwight Tuckwood	Sue McCollum	III
Purdue University	Joseph Dagnese	Michael Buckland	I
University of Rochester	Ben Bowman	Sul H. Lee	III
Rutgers University	Virginia Whitney	Donald Luck	II
Smithsonian Institution	Russell Shank	Elaine Sloan	II
University of Tennessee	Richard Boss	George Shipman	I
University of Washington	Marion Milczewski	Penny Abell	II
Washington State University	Donald Smith	Donna McCool	III

APPENDIX N

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

Introduction

Developments in personnel, automation, and networking during 1973 had a strong impact on the internal development of the Library and on its relationship with the agricultural community. The single most significant factor has been in the area of automation with the expansion of information retrieval capabilities from the Cataloging and Indexing (CAIN) data base through the use of on-line terminals.

Personnel

The Director, John Sherrod, announced plans to accept a position with Informatics Inc., as General Manager of the NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility, College Park, Md.; his resignation was effective March 31, 1973. Mr. Sherrod was appointed Director of the National Agricultural Library February 1968. During his tenure as Director, he implemented the Agricultural Sciences Information Network, increasing the cooperative arrangement between the agricultural libraries of the Land-Grant Universities and the National Agricultural Library. He worked closely with FAO in developing the concept of AGRIS, an international information system for agricultural sciences and technology. A successor to Mr. Sherrod has not yet been named.

Acting Director of the Library is Dr. Joseph F. Caponio. Named as Associate Director in 1970, he has shared with the Director responsibility for administering the 1.5 million volume collection and providing lending, reference and other library services to the agricultural-biological community.

In spite of personnel ceiling reductions, production was maintained in 1973 and in some cases increased. Additionally, a number of new projects were initiated.

Automation

A computer group was formed at NAL in 1964; its initial activity was in developing systems to prepare voluminous indexes for the Bibliography of Agriculture, the complete Pesticides Documentation Bulletin, and categorical and alphabetical volumes of the Agricultural/Biological Vocabulary. During 1969 these systems were consolidated and expanded so as to process all input data within one coordinated set of parameters. The new Cataloging and Indexing System (CAIN) implemented January 1970 was a broad-based comprehensive batch mode system designed to meet many library requirements.

From the CAIN tapes, two major publication products are prepared by trade publishers. One is The National Agricultural Library Catalog, compiled monthly. This Catalog contains not only a listing by main entry, but also indexes of personal authors, corporate authors, subjects and titles; the indexes cumulate semi-annually and annually. The Bibliography of Agriculture is a monthly index to the literature of agriculture and allied sciences.

The NAL machine-readable data base (CAIN) was placed on-line in the summer of 1973. The contract specifications called for a 150,000-record file initially, with additions on a monthly basis. Requirements included the ability to handle many terminals with a simultaneous interrogation and a high-speed reaction time. The successful bidder was Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, Inc. The contract provides NAL with on-line interactive bibliographic search and retrieval to the CAIN data base. This data base now includes all bibliographic records, numbering 400,000, entered into the CAIN data base beginning in 1970, plus pesticides data acquired in 1967-1969. Beginning December 1973, records of material in the Library's Food and Nutrition Information and Educational Materials Center, (FNIC), with abstracts, are entered into the CAIN system.

Systems Development Corporation has also announced availability of on-line access to the CAIN data base. The competition has improved service. Both claim good response from the agricultural community.

The efforts of NAL have been concentrated in two areas: making the availability of the on-line system known to the agricultural community and training for effective use of the system. Formal presentations have been made to prominent agriculturalists, representatives of Land-Grant Libraries, the Federal Library Workshop 1973, and the American Society for Information Science. A training program has been initiated for selected staff members who will receive special instruction in on-line systems and data base construction.

In addition to CAIN, the NAL Serials Data Base of 24,000 titles has been put into machine-readable form. The Serials Data Base is being exploited for two major purposes: to expedite serials handling and to improve document delivery. Numerous lists of STAR (Serial Titles Automated Record), KWOC and other user required formats - covering all titles currently received, the full serial file, or special lists - can be issued for internal or external use. The data base was also used in the renewal and gap-filling process. Renewals of periodical subscriptions for the calendar year 1974 were completed by computer by mid-September of this year, with a considerable saving in manpower over the previous manual system. Despite the very extensive serial collections at NAL, holdings for many titles are incomplete. Arrangements were made with the United States Book Exchange (USBE) to acquire and supply missing issues listed on a computer print-out of missing journal issues supplied by NAL. About 7,000 pieces (issues and bound volumes) have been supplied to date by USBE.

Other U.S.D.A. agencies are using our Serials Data Base in order to further their own researches. A magnetic print tape listing all serial titles in the data base was furnished to Agricultural Research Service (ARS) for review. From this master list, ARS will be able to produce specialized lists of serial titles tailored to their needs. The Forest Service has completed a preliminary selection from our data base of titles which meet the needs of Forest Service users.

Other Data Bases

A Memorandum of Understanding between NAL and the National Library of Medicine (NLM) provides direct access to medical literature sources for agricultural scientists and researchers. A MEDLINE terminal was placed into operation at NAL on November 19, 1973. This terminal gives USDA scientists on-line access to a significant collection of biomedical literature. One member of the NAL Reference Staff received extensive training at NLM and will be responsible for MEDLINE operations at NAL.

Terminal facilities for JURIS (Justice retrieval and inquiry system of the U.S. Department of Justice) were established in our Law Library (Room 1052, South Agriculture Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250). This system presently provides access to significant briefs and memos within Justice back to January 1972 and ten years of Supreme Court decisions and Solicitor General briefs to the Supreme Court from February 1973. While this system is used largely by USDA Office of General Counsel personnel, the NAL staff at the Law Library is also trained to use it.

NAL, in cooperation with a number of other federal government libraries, is funding an experiment in utilizing cataloging data obtained by on-line access to a large data base maintained by the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC). The benefits to NAL will be a reduction in the amount of required keyboarding by our own staff and a more efficient processing of newly acquired books.

In the coming year, NAL anticipates it will be able to make a number of other data bases available to its users through on-line commercial systems. A direct-to-tape CRT data entry system will also be utilized.

Networks

The growth of agricultural literature has been such that only a sustained and systematic cooperative effort can insure the organization and dissemination of this knowledge for access by all users. Since 1969, NAL has urged the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to assume a coordinating role for the development and operation of a worldwide system for agricultural information similar to those in operation for chemistry and atomic energy. The pilot phase for implementation of this International Information System for Agricultural Sciences and

Technology (AGRIS) began in March, 1973 under FAO sponsorship. One tangible demonstration of progress was the publication in 1973 of an experimental issue of AGRINDEX. NAL contributed 3,000 citations to articles in U. S. published journals. The input from NAL was processed and merged with data from other countries. This experimental issue of AGRINDEX contained nearly 7,000 entries referring to a worldwide sample of current conventional and non-conventional literature. Funding to support system implementation in 1975 was approved by FAO late this year. This new system will have a major impact on indexing at NAL. It is expected ultimately to nearly double the amount of agricultural documentation available to the NAL at no significant increase in cost to the Library. (See Appendix)

A second phase in the development of this system is the implementation of the international Agricultural Libraries Network (AGLINET). NAL agreed to serve as a regional center for the Network in October 1973. NAL will provide the traditional interlibrary loan, reference/bibliographic, and reprographic services to member libraries of AGLINET. The agreement is in force as of January 1, 1974.

On the national level, NAL has continued to move towards the establishment of a National Agricultural Libraries Network.

The preliminary results of a trial delivery of documents in original or photocopy to USDA employees through the land-grant university libraries in Louisiana, Texas, and Mississippi have demonstrated the feasibility and positive benefits of performing this service through a network operation. The pilot project served approximately 2,000 library patrons in the three states who utilized literature in discharging their research, testing, and management responsibilities. The project also determined costs and benefits of shifting some of the library services heretofore provided Department employees in the field by the National Agricultural Library in Washington to a nearby library. The participating libraries included Louisiana State University, Mississippi State University, Texas A & M University and the USDA Agricultural Research Service and the Forest Service Libraries in New Orleans. It appears that approximately 85% of the requests for publications generated by the USDA field agencies can be handled in the same region through this network approach.

An expanded document delivery project to provide services to USDA employees in the South was begun by the University of Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina. This six-state document delivery project utilized existing facilities of the land-grant institutions and the USDA agency field libraries within the region as a resource network of documents to USDA personnel located within the project area. USDA personnel submit document requests directly to their responsible USDA field library or the nearest land-grant institution library in their state. The receiving library fills the request, if possible, and mails it directly back to the requestor. Unfilled requests are referred to the largest land-grant library in the state for completion. The largest land-grant library in a state acts as the resource library for that state. Requests which can not be promptly completed at the largest state land-grant institution library are channeled to the University of Georgia Libraries, which acts both as the resource for Georgia and as the six state regional resource center. State resource libraries attempt to complete all requests coming to them when easily identified and when the bibliographic resources for verification are immediately available. Otherwise, the regional resource performs the verification and the identification of locations for borrowing. Requests which are not filled at the University of Georgia Libraries are teletyped to NAL as the final resource. Texas A & M University performs the same document service for USDA employees in that State and interacts directly with NAL.

A similar project began in June with the University of California, Davis Library implementing a document delivery system on a pilot project basis for USDA field personnel in the tri state region of California, Arizona, and Oregon. Service includes both lending books and supplying photocopies. All requests must be for specific titles. The U.C.D. Library works in cooperation with the libraries of the Universities of Arizona and Oregon.

A grant was awarded the University of California, Davis Library to identify, acquire, and index for the National Agricultural Library publications from California, Arizona, Nevada, Washington, and Hawaii containing research information for agriculturalists. Information on these publications is input to NAL's CAIN data base and published in the Bibliography of Agriculture.

Memoranda of understanding have been signed between NAL and 17 land-grant university libraries. Under the terms of these memoranda the land-grant libraries will collect, store, and provide ready access to complete files of the major serial publications of their State agricultural experiment stations, extension service, and colleges of agriculture. These files will be identified as the National Resource Copies for library access and as such will be kept in near perfect condition and in the original format. NAL will serve as coordinator for completion of State sets and discarding of files.

Other Cooperative Activities

NAL is an interested supporter of Federal Library Committee (FLC) activities. As previously noted, the Library is working through FLC to obtain access to the Ohio College Library Center on-line system.

NAL is cooperating with the National Libraries Task Force (NLTF) and the National Serials Data Program in building a large serials data base, which will result in a register of the serial holdings of the three national libraries. NAL is currently submitting data to the Program on its newly acquired serials. Unique identifying numbers (Standard Serial Numbers) are assigned to each registered serial. Use of the Standard Serial numbers will speed up the basic processing routines of ordering, check-in and claiming of important journals.

Other Highlights

The Law Library of NAL has obtained and can now provide service from the Congressional Information Service (CIS) Microfiche File. This File contains all congressional hearings, reports, and documents from 1970 to date on microfiche. Documents are indexed according to names of hearing witnesses, their affiliations, the subjects they discussed, the popular names of laws, reports, and bills, names of subcommittees, and names of authors. The material can be consulted or copied as microfiche or full size. Index/abstracts are available in hard copy. Beginning January 1974, USDA legislative histories will be prepared in microfiche only, combining materials from the CIS file with fiche of other relevant documents, prepared by USDA.

Several actions taken in February/March were designed to improve the responsiveness of the Library to user needs. On February 23, patrons of the Law Library were officially introduced to the new improved quarters and facilities in USDA South Building (1406) for study and research. On March 3, an agreement was signed in support and continuance of the Tri-Agency Reading Room, 500 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D. C., which provides reference support services to three USDA agencies: Economic Research Service, Farmers Cooperative Service, and Food and Nutrition Service.

NAL is continuing the cooperative development with the Food and Nutrition Service, USDA of the Food and Nutrition Information and Educational Materials Center (FNIC). The Center, located at NAL, is designed to disseminate information on food service training and nutrition education. FNIC assembles and maintains a collection of materials useful in training personnel for food management of Child Nutrition Programs, School Lunch, Breakfast, and other non-school food service programs. The staff provides material for loan to school and food service personnel and other supportive groups. The collection includes films, video cassettes, programmed instructional material, audiotape, manuals, guides, pamphlets, books, and selected serials.

Three important products were completed in 1973 by FNIC. These are a Catalog, Exhibit, and Slide-Tape Presentation, which will provide major links between the Center and its user community. The Exhibit and the Slide-Tape Presentation communicate information about the Center, its purpose, location, staff, and services related in context to target users. An initial display of the Exhibit was made at the American School Food Service Association, July 29 - August 2 in New Orleans. Distribution of the Catalog has been made to all State School Food Service Directors, State Training Specialists, Food and Nutrition personnel and to a selected mailing list. Additionally, FNIC is distributing three bibliographies prepared under contract by the Society for Nutrition Education.

Food Habits: a selected annotated bibliography (January - March 1973)

Methods and kinds of nutrition education (1961 - 72)

Nutrition education materials for Spanish speaking Americans.

Records of materials in the Center's collection have been incorporated in the CAIN data base, and are accessible on-line. The records will be updated monthly. The FNIC data base is also available on a separate tape and searchable as part of CAIN, or as a complete file.

Publications

New improved features were incorporated into the Bibliography of Agriculture in 1973. These include a Geographic Index, an expanded Corporate Author Index and a more specific, sophisticated and easier to use Subject Index. The Main Entry Section has been expanded to include 70 categories. The publisher, Macmillan Information, a division of the Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., with the cooperation of NAL has developed a new vocabulary control system for the computer-produced subject index. The former control list of 12,000 general purpose terms has been refined and expanded to over 25,000 terms relevant to agriculture.

The *National Agricultural Library Catalog*, 1966-1970 was published in 1973. This 12-volume set was reproduced from the library's divided card catalog and supplements the *Dictionary Catalog, 1862-1965*. It is expected that future cumulations will be computer-produced.

A computer-produced list of *1000 Selected Journals in Agriculture and Related Subjects* was published in August 1973, to assist NAL users in obtaining prompt, accurate responses to their requests for journal articles. This new publication represents journal titles frequently requested from NAL and provides the NAL call number of each journal.

Dr. Joseph F. Caponio collaborated with Dr. Marilyn Bracken of the Office of Information Systems on the preparation of a directory of "Selected Food and Agricultural Data Bases in the U.S.A." The directory was published in the *Quarterly Bulletin of the International Association of Agricultural Librarians and Documentalists*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1973.

An irregular informational letter to land-grant college librarians was initiated by the Director. It is planned to use this means to keep the land-grant institutions informed on matters of mutual interest, particularly in areas where cooperative and network activities may be promoted.

Conclusion

The future growth of the National Agricultural Library is oriented towards close cooperation with the entire agricultural community both on the national and international scene. Communication of agricultural information will utilize sophisticated automated programs, as well as traditional means. In achieving closer working relationships with all spheres of agricultural research and industry NAL will tend to act more and more as a clearinghouse. The original mission statement of 1862 directed the collection and dissemination of useful information on agricultural subjects. Rather than attempting to become a complete and exhaustive storehouse of agricultural knowledge, NAL will rely on a network system or partnership with other agricultural libraries, each with its own special responsibilities. For this network, however, NAL will continue to be a library of last resort.

APPENDIX

Agrindex

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has been working with representatives from many countries to create an international index and alerting tool for agriculture. The National Agricultural Library has been involved in these discussions, which have led to an experimental 600-page issue and funding for the project. Systematic publication will begin in January 1975. The index will have citations contributed from nine national centers, including the National Agricultural Library, and be published bi-weekly with approximately 6,500 citations per issue. A magnetic tape will be available to the national centers, and also may be sold by FAO monthly to others.

For the National Agricultural Library this means consideration of a heavy investment of resources in different tape formats, methods of literature coverage, altered internal procedures, and changed external commitments. NAL has taken the position that eventual bibliographic improvement will result, but we are seeking to avoid any degradation of our current products and services. Agrindex is envisioned by FAO as a current awareness tool with citations grouped under 115 broad topics, which are further divided into 300 headings. Three indexes to the basic entries in Agrindex are proposed: (a) a personal author index; (b) an index of corporate entries and conferences; and (c) a report number index. A geographic index and a subject index to crops are under active discussion; KWOC methods may be used.

The methods of publication and distribution of Agrindex are not firmly set since alternatives are still being considered. It seems fairly clear that such a publication will have a significant impact on the form or viability of existing major indexes.

The Agrindex is the first major product of the FAO international effort which comes under its International Information System for the Agricultural Sciences and Technology (AGRIS).

APPENDIX O

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The National Library of Medicine has completed its second year of MEDLINE operation, providing on-line services to more than 250 institutions in the continental United States. Extension of the commercial communication network which supports MEDLINE to a limited number of key cities in Western Europe and the establishment of an interface with the ARPA network, has made direct on-line access to the NLM computer and its MEDLARS data bases from Hawaii and Alaska and Western Europe. A free standing network in Stockholm provides MEDLINE services in Scandinavia.

During the early part of 1973 MEDLINE searches reached an annual rate of more than 200,000. Access has been provided to hospitals and health care delivery institutions, so that by the end of the year, about 20 percent of the use originated in non-academic based hospitals.

In order to maintain reliable service, a backup computer capability was established early in 1973 at the State University of New York in Albany. The computer at NLM was upgraded by replacing an IBM/155 computer with an IBM/158.

In order to establish a reasonable control in the growth of the services and to maintain financial stability in the operation, a marginal service charge of $6.00 per connect hour and 10¢ per computer page print-out was established by NLM during the latter part of 1973. The charge is collected by the network operator (TYMSHARE) from MEDLINE organizations and is used to offset the marginal network costs. An important result has been the elimination of all toll charges to users to access the network and a more equitable arrangement for "equal access" has been established.

Less than half the institutions with MEDLINE terminals impose on their users an additional charge for the personnel time of an analyst who negotiates the search request. A maximum total charge by MEDLINE organizations of $5.00 per search (representing one-half hour of analyst time) has been established as the greatest charge that can be leveled on an individual user.

Experience during the last three months of 1973 indicates that the "marginal fee" structure which was established has resulted in a leveling off in the rate of the growth in service demands although usage continues to increase at a slow rate.

During 1973, an on-line catalog data base (CATLINE) containing about 100,000 monographs cataloged at NLM since 1965 has been implemented, as well as a serials data base of approximately 5,000 of the most significant biomedical serials with locator codes for 117 medical library institutions in the U.S. These data bases, coupled with the MEDLINE citation file are being developed as the core for an on-line regional medical library network to link bibliographic access to medical literature with a corresponding document delivery system.

APPENDIX P

Vol. 33, No. 2 January 11, 1974

SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS JANUARY 1974

LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

LC Appropriations for Fiscal 1974

The President on November 1 signed H.R. 6691 (Public Law 93-145), an Act authorizing appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal 1974.

Included in the Act is a direct appropriation of $82,371,150 to the Library of Congress.

Of this amount there is $39,458,000 for Library of Congress salaries and expenses (Administrative, Processing, and Reference Departments, the Law Library, and the Office of the Librarian). The Congress approved 98 additional positions under this appropriation.

For the Copyright Office, an appropriation of $5,139,000 was made.

An appropriation of $10,927,000 was made to the Congressional Research Service. An additional 94 positions were authorized.

Under the appropriation heading of Distribution of Catalog Cards, $10,343,000 was made available.

An appropriation of $9,805,000 was made for the operation of the program for Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.

An appropriation of $1,194,650 was made for Books for the General Collections and $208,500 for Books for the Law Library.

For the P.L. 480 program, an appropriation of $2,267,000 was made. This includes $1,971,400 in U.S.-owned foreign currencies and $295,000 in U.S. dollars.

An appropriation of $2,868,000 was made for furniture and furnishings, $2,325,000 of which will be for the second increment of furniture for the initial outfitting of the James Madison Memorial Building.

Also included was $29,000 for the preparation and updating of the *Constitution Annotated* and $132,000 for a continuation of assistance to the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives in preparing a supplementary edition of the *Precedents of the House.*

Copyright Legislation

On July 31 and August 1, 1973, hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. 1361, the bill for the general revision of the copyright law. The issues on which testimony was given included library photocopying; a proposal for general educational exemptions; the cable television royalty schedule; a proposed exemption for recording religious music for authorized broadcasts; and the carriage of sporting events by cable television. Senator John L. McClellan, Chairman of the Subcommittee, has indicated that the Subcommittee will meet in February 1974 to mark up the revision bill. Senator McClellan has also indicated that proposals along the lines of S. 1359, which would amend the copyright law to preclude a foreign country from taking over the rights of its authors to U.S. copyright, in order to suppress publication of their works in this country, would be included in the general revision bill.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT

The Third Committee of Governmental Experts on Problems in the Field of Copyright and the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms, and Broadcasting Organizations Raised by Transmission via Space Satellites held a meeting in July 1973 in Nairobi, Kenya. As a result of the meeting, in which Abe A. Goldman, the Acting Register of Copyrights, participated as a member of the U.S. delegation, a new draft Convention Relating to the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals Transmitted by Satellite was prepared, and a resolution was adopted recommending that a diplomatic conference be convened in 1974 for the purpose of concluding an international convention on this subject.

In December 1973, the Intergovernmental Copyright Committee of the Universal Copyright Convention met in Paris for its regular biennial meeting. Some of its sessions were held jointly with the Executive Committee of the Berne Union on topics of common interest. Among these topics were an examination of the feasibility of an international instrument concerning the reprographic reproduction of works protected by copyright and a draft model law on copyright for developing countries in Africa. Barbara A. Ringer, the Register of Copyrights, participated in the meeting as a member of the U.S. delegation.

On October 1, 1973, the Senate, by unanimous vote, approved the ratification by the United States of the Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of Their Phonograms. The instrument of ratification by the United States was deposited with the United Nations on November 26, 1973. The Convention, which requires no implementing legislation by the United States, since its laws are already in conformity with it, shall enter into force with respect to the United States three months after the date on which the Director General of the World Intellectual Property Organization informs the States of the deposit of the instrument. Other member countries include Argentina, Fiji, Finland, France, Mexico, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

Construction of Phase III of the James Madison Memorial Building moved forward rapidly during the past six months, although planning for Phase IV slowed down. By the end of the year the fifth floor had been partially completed and columns were being formed up for the sixth floor in the northeast corner of the building, while the lower courses of granite and marble were being set in place on the southwest corner.

Phase IV planning was delayed for a number of reasons beyond LC's control, and by early fall it was clear that this phase could not go to bid until at least October 1974. Drawings representing approximately 95 percent completion of the Phase IV work were received by the Building Planning Office (BPO) on the first of November. The draft specifications were received a few days later. Much of the effort of the Building Planning Office is currently being expended on checking these drawings and specifications.

At the same time, the staff of the interior design group of the BPO was finalizing furniture and room layouts and developing work station designs with the occupying units. Testing and evaluation of the compact bookstack design, developed by the Building Planning Office and erected at the Pickett Street Annex, was completed and the engineering staff was engaged in the preparation of the technical specifications for this equipment. It is expected that bids for the compact bookstacks will be requested in the spring of 1974.

Because of the delay in completion of the Phase IV drawings and specifications, it now appears that the building will not be ready for occupancy before early in calendar 1977, or possibly later.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Affirmative Action

The Library of Congress Affirmative Action Plan for Fiscal Year 1974 was announced to the Library staff in Special Announcement 585 of August 20, and reprinted in the LC *Information Bulletin* of August 24. The 1974 Plan continued the incompleted items of the 1973 Plan and established four major program objectives for fiscal 1974: the establishment of an Affirmative Action Coordinating Committee to provide interdepartmental communication and coordination and maintain a Library-wide overview of the Affirmative Action program; the initiation of Training and Performance Appraisal Agreements to offer 26 employees with considerable experience but who lack educational credentials an opportunity to be promoted and demonstrate their ability to perform in higher graded positions; the evaluation of the Library's employment tests and qualifications requirements for job relatedness and business necessity; and the counseling and establishing of Career Plans for each employee participating in the Library's Tuition Support program.

The adoption of the 1974 Affirmative Action Plan climaxed a significant program of communication and opinion exchange between employees, employee organizations, and those responsible for developing the plan. Most important of these inputs was the Affirmative Action Survey conducted in June and published July 27. This questionnaire was distributed to all Library staff and 1,759 (approximately 44 percent) responded, giving their opinions and preferences for programs to be included in the 1974 Plan. The largest percentage of employees thought "Training and Education programs" should be given first priority, followed by "Promotion and Reassignment programs," "Evaluation of Employees' Potential," and so on to "Recruitment programs" which they thought should be given last priority. Approximately two-thirds of the employees felt that emphasis should be placed on training, but on training fewer employees for predetermined and certain opportunities rather than larger numbers for expected but uncertain opportunities. More than two-thirds of those responding felt the 1974 Plan should concentrate on a few objectives rather than spread resources over a larger number of objectives. Employees were asked "If the Affirmative Action Plan were 100 percent effective during Fiscal 1974 what major change or event would you expect to occur as a result of this effectiveness?" In terms of their primary expectations more employees expected "improved employee morale/less unrest/more job satisfaction/happier, contented workforce/lower turnover" followed by "greater efficiency," "more promotions/upward mobility," and "more opportunities for training, education, job advancement, and job experiences." These and the many other specific suggestions that were offered in the Affirmative Action Survey provided the main input for the development of the 1974 Affirmative Action Plan.

The progress made by the Library of Congress in its Affirmative Action program can be summarized as follows.

Objective 1: The Affirmative Action Coordinating Committee was established and met on six occassions between September 11 and December 4. The Committee assisted in increasing funds for Tuition Support and coordinated the administration of the Training and Performance Agreement program in each Department of the Library and in the Librarian's Office. The membership of the Committee was increased on November 13 by the appointment of a representative of the Equal Opportunity Office (to give the Committee expert information on the nature of complaints of discrimination being filed by employees, thus enhancing the Committee's ability to recommend programs that would anticipate problems before they resulted in complaints being filed).

Objective 2: The Library's Training and Performance Agreements program was initiated on October 10 with the Library's announcement that 38 positions would be allocated to this effort. (This was 12 more than the 26 positions planned.) As of December 31, 17 of these positions were filled. All positions were filled through competition among employees in which the emphasis was placed primarily on the employee's performance record and motivation and secondly on educational credentials. Of the remaining 21 positions, 19 were announced to the staff and applications were accepted and are under consideration, with the selections expected to be made early in January 1974. Two positions were in the process of being announced.

Objective 3: An outside research consultant was contracted to review and evaluate employment tests administered in the Library and make recommendations for improvement. The study was completed and a final report was submitted on November 12. The Personnel Office is currently developing a recommendation on what should be the Library's response to this study and its findings.

Objective 4: All 119 employees who signed up for the Tuition Support program were counseled by the Employee Development Specialist of the Library of Congress. The Library's Training Office maintains written Career Plans for each participant and monitors their progress in terms of that Plan. During the first semester of the 1973-74 academic year the Library spent $16,000 for employees' tuition at 15 local colleges and universities.

In addition to progress on the major objectives, the Library made significant advancement in program areas of the 1974 Affirmative Action Plan during the first half of fiscal 1974. In the Public Services Careers program, 23 out of 33 entry component participants passed either or both the clerical and typing tests and were assigned permanent positions in the Library; the Training Office counseled 136 employees seeking advice on how to advance their careers and as a result of this counseling approximately 100 entered more formal and directed programs; the Library of Congress Individual Advancement Plan (LCIAP) advanced from the "test" to the "operational" stage; and the Personnel Office initiated a one-page, "Affirmative Action News" primarily for informing employees on the Library's Affirmative Action program (publishing two issues during this reporting period).

Equal Opportunity Office

Communication about the Library's Equal Opportunity Program has been of major concern to the Equal Opportunity Office. Information about the program is now being included within new employees' orientation.

In addition to monthly talks to staff and new employees, a sound/slide presentation is now being prepared to illustrate how the equal opportunity complaints procedure works in the Library of Congress.

The Library of Congress Regulation on discrimination complaints procedure was revised during this period. The draft was distributed for review and response by the six departments, the Human Relations Committees, union and staff organizations before final revision. Distribution is to be made early in January.

Beginning September 1973, two additional officers, six additional counselors, and one assistant secretary were added to the Equal Opportunity staff bringing the total staff complement to 17, including four full-time staff members. During this period, staff members received instructions in the following courses: Appeals Examining, Personnel Management for EEO Specialists, Instructor Training, EEO Counseling, and Advanced EEO Counseling.

Within the July-November period, there were 35 instances of alleged discrimination filed in the Equal Opportunity Office; of them, 17 allegations were resolved at the Counselor level, four were transferred to the Employee Relations Office as being within its jurisdiction, and the remainder were further processed in the Equal Opportunity Office.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS INTERN PROGRAM, 1974-75

The Library of Congress Intern Program for selected members of the Library staff and outstanding graduates of library schools will be reinstated for 1974-75. As in the past, the expectation will be that those who complete the program will continue their careers at the Library. Selections from library schools will be made from nominations submitted by deans and directors. Selection of LC staff members will be made from nominations submitted by division chiefs and may include candidates with backgrounds in library science or in other disciplines needed in the Library's activities.

The program offers up to 17 weeks of seminars, tours, and rotating work assignments. Its purpose is to give in-depth orientation in the Library's functions, activities, and policies in order to provide a background for fuller job performance, and to assist in developing career potential for a variety of positions in the Library.

ACQUISITIONS

National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging (NPAC)

The fiscal 1974 appropriation of $8,098,346 for NPAC did not include any of the funds requested for expansion of the program. In May 1973 the House Committee on Appropriations initiated an in-depth study and investigation of the operation of the entire NPAC program "to develop the necessary background information required for future decisions as to funding needs." The report is expected to be completed before the end of the calendar year and in the hands of the Appropriations Committee before hearings on the Library's fiscal 1975 budget request. It is not known whether the report will be made public.

The joint P. L. 480/NPAC office in Belgrade was closed in August 1973 with the termination of the P. L. 480 Program in Yugoslavia. Arrangements were established for the NPAC shared cataloging program to continue, with the Jugoslovenski Bibliografski Institut in Belgrade supplying prepublication bibliographic data prepared for the *Bibliografija Jugoslavije* directly to LC to be matched with LC's Yugoslav receipts obtained through purchase, exchange, and other sources. These procedures are similar to the NPAC arrangements now in effect for USSR publications and bibliographic data. There have been delays in receipts during the transition period.

In fiscal 1973 NPAC participating libraries reported 123,568 titles for which cataloging was not located at first search. Eighty percent of these titles had already been received at LC or were already on order. Those titles were advanced to a higher cataloging priority as a result of the reports. The remaining titles (24,213–19.6 percent) were ordered for cataloging on demand. From the beginning of the NPAC program in June 1966 through June 1973 a total of 815,564 reports have been searched, resulting in orders being placed for 168,351 titles not previously acquired by LC. These figures refer only to current titles (in NPAC terms this means the current five years) reported from the 24 NPAC shared cataloging countries. As a result of a review of NPAC reporting by participating libraries carried on this summer, distribution of the NPAC depository set was reduced to 62 libraries.

Public Law 480 Program

The P. L. 480 Program continues in fiscal 1974 at a considerably reduced level, having lost two field offices (in Belgrade and Tel Aviv) because of the lack of excess foreign currencies. Sri Lanka publications are still being acquired by the New Delhi office, but only for the 17 libraries which were prepared to contribute sufficient U.S. dollars to cover the purchase price of a set of publications as well as a portion of the administrative costs. The chief burden of administration is born by the P. L. 480 Program, utilizing the staff and resources of the New Delhi office, which continues to issue an *Accessions List* for Sri Lanka and to provide participants with preliminary catalog cards for publications distributed. The New Delhi office will also continue to issue an *Accessions List:*

Bangladesh although the multiple-copy acquisitions program for Bangladesh ceased in June 1973.

Personnel changes include the appointment of Jerry R. James, former Field Director of the P. L. 480 office in Belgrade, as Field Director in Pakistan and Acting Field Director in Cairo, where he spends approximately one week out of each month. In New Delhi, E. Gene Smith, former cataloging consultant to that office, is now Assistant Field Director for Cataloging.

The revised distribution of publications to participants in the South Asia Program has resulted in a 10 percent reduction of pieces acquired by the New Delhi office and a 30 percent reduction of pieces acquired by the Karachi office. In addition to opting for a reduction of material in most languages, most participating libraries also eliminated completely from their selection some languages in which they had previously been receiving considerable material.

The Cairo office continued to operate through the October war although the distribution of publications was interrupted temporarily. Visits of the Acting Field Director were resumed in November.

The number of serial subscriptions and standing orders renewed in October for participants in the Polish Program was reduced from 583 titles to 442 titles for calendar 1974. Deletions were based on recommendations submitted by several participants in September and October. Furthermore, a reduction of costs was considered desirable in view of the lack of definitive information available from the U.S. Treasury Department on the amount of P. L. 480 Polish zlotys which the Library will be authorized to spend in fiscal 1974.

EXCHANGE AND GIFT DIVISION ACTIVITIES

Monthly Checklist of State Publications

On August 21, 1973, the U.S. Government Printing Office with the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing approved a new scale for establishing the sales price for all publications sold by the Superintendent of Documents. As a result, the price of the *Monthly Checklist of State Publications*, effective January 1974, will be $12.80 per year, $3.20 additional for foreign mailing. Single monthly issues will cost 90 cents, except June and December, $1.55; the *Index* will cost $1.25.

During the period from July through December 1973 a total of 14,235 titles were listed in the *Checklist*, as compared with 12,584 titles listed during the same period in 1972, an increase of approximately 13 percent.

Federal Documents Section

The Federal Documents Section continues to receive material under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P. L. 92-463). As of the end of November 1973, fiscal 1974 receipts include 158 charters and 89 reports. A listing of annual reports and other data on advisory committees was compiled by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Budgeting, Management and Expenditures, and issued as a committee print dated May 2, 1973, under the title *Federal Advisory Committees; First Annual Report of the President to the Congress, Including Data on Individual Committees*, March 1973. Copies of the committee print have been added to the Library's collections.

The current issue of *Non-GPO Imprints Received in the Library of Congress: A Selective Checklist* was published in the fall. Larger than the two preceding checklists, it includes 408 monographic entries and 142 periodical entries. Comments from users of the checklist on its usefulness would be welcomed by the Exchange and Gift Division. The publication is for sale by the Card Division for $1.25.

Documents Expediting Project (Doc Ex)

In fiscal 1973 Doc Ex was able to fill 73 percent of the participants' special requests. Through November 1973 the Project staff again filled 73 percent of the subscribers' requests, or 2,652 of the 3,632 requests handled. By the end of November 1973, 27,507 more pieces had been sent out by Doc Ex than during the same period last year and 191 more titles were distributed, an increase of approximately 13 percent in the number of titles distributed.

Exchanges

From July 1, 1973 to the end of November 1973, the African-Asian Exchange Section had received a total of 286 monographs and serials from the following sources: the National Library of Peking, 81; the State Public Library, Ulan-Bator, Mongolia, 9; the State Central Library, Pyongyang, North Korea, 45; and the Library of Social Sciences in Hanoi, 151.

The Hispanic Exchange Section is currently conducting active exchange relations with 46 Cuban institutions including all the universities, the majority of the research institutions and practically all of the central government ministries. The Section receives, on a regular basis, 190 serial titles and almost all of the monographic works being issued in Cuba. Some official publications such as annual reports, fiscal studies, statistical compilations, or development plans of the ministries have not been forthcoming, nor has the official gazette.

Gifts

The Exchange and Gift Division's gifts and deposits for the first part of FY 1974 include materials added to the following manuscript collections already housed in the Library of Congress: MacKinley Kantor, John Hall Wheelock, Senator Robert A. Taft, Toni Frissell, Lucy Kroll, Gifford Pinchot, Elmer Gertz, Gutzon Borglum, Louise Bates Ames, Vincent Price, Archibald MacLeish, James Michener, Margaret Webster, Chester Arthur, and the American Psychological Association. Additional music manuscripts were added to these collections: Waldo Peirce, Teo Macero, Walter Piston, Joseph Goodman, and George Antheil. Other library materials added to existing collections included original drawings by Howard Brodie and photographs by Arthur Rothstein.

Among new acquisitions received are papers of Captain Eddie Rickenbacker, Judge Simon E. Sobeloff, and Judge E. Barrett Prettyman. Other new library materials include music manuscripts of Amedeo de Filippi and Edward B. Claypoole, composite nitrate film of Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers dances from each of their RKO pictures, original political cartoons of Gibson M. Crockett, and photographs by Theodore Horydczak.

Other important acquisitions were two letters of Andrew Jackson to General John Chaffee, dated May 1821, and a two-and-one-half-page ALS of James Monroe, dated Paris, November 19, 1794. The Monroe letter appears to be heretofore unknown and unpublished.

ORDER DIVISION ACTIVITIES

Receipts of library materials from Latin America on newly placed blanket orders have begun, but it is too soon to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Because of the interest of many other U.S. research libraries in Latin American acquisitions to replace the now-defunct Latin American Cooperative Acquisitions Program, close contact is being maintained with acquisitions staff in major research libraries. It is hoped that blanket orders for materials from Yugoslavia and Israel will provide a relatively smooth transition from the previous P. L. 480 arrangements.

CATALOGING

Factors affecting LC acquisitions are beginning to have some effect on the nature, though not the volume, of the Library's cataloging production. The combination of much improved implementation of selection guidelines by the bookdealers in NPAC countries and the noticeable decline in book production, particularly in Western Europe, will be reflected in a gradual increase in the relative percentage of noncurrent titles that are cataloged. An interesting example of this effect is that it has now been possible to get many long backlogged titles in Scandinavian languages through the stage of descriptive cataloging. Another effect of the decline in pressures for cataloging current materials from particular NPAC countries will be the possibility of staff readjustments to increase the cataloging of receipts from other countries, previously less well supported. The most noticeable change in American acquisitions has been the sharp reduction in reprint publishing. Despite these developments the number of titles newly cataloged is holding at about last year's rate.

An analysis completed in November of the throughput time from receipt of book to production of catalog card revealed that in the priority categories that encompass the bulk of current NPAC receipts completion time was six weeks earlier as compared with the situation last March.

Cataloging in Publication

There are presently over 500 publishers participating in the CIP program. Since the beginning of the program in July 1971, over 26,000 titles have been processed, including 1,400 titles cooperatively cataloged by the Library of Congress with the National Library of Medicine. Weekly receipts continue to average between 250 and 350 titles.

The program is now funded under the regular ongoing LC appropriation from Congress. In September project staff began to contact Federal agencies to request their participation in CIP. Document titles selected for CIP processing will initially be those that are widely acquired and cataloged by American libraries. Agencies are being phased into the program as staff schedules and work loads permit. An effort is also being made to secure the participation of the remaining trade publishers and effect 100 percent coverage from the participating publishers.

Cataloging Rules Development

With final agreements on the provisions of the International Standard Bibliographic Description-Monographs (ISBD(M)) having been reached at the Grenoble meeting of IFLA, work has been proceeding to finish the revision of Chapter 6 (Description) of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR)* to reflect the ISBD(M) for submission to the committees of the American and Canadian Library Associations for approval and eventual publication by ALA. The latter should take place early in 1974, probably shortly after the time the ISBD(M) itself will be published.

Concurrently work has begun on a revision of chapter 12 of the *AACR* (Motion Pictures and Filmstrips) which will cover specialized instructional materials in addition to materials for projection. The source materials to be used in preparing the draft are three recently published manuals and standards: *Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials* (Association for Educational Communications and Technology); *Nonbook Materials, the Organization of Integrated Collections* (Canadian Library Association); *Nonbook Materials Cataloguing Rules* (National Council of Educational Technology with the Library Association); and the *Nonprint Media Guidelines* recently produced by an ad hoc task force, Pearce S. Grove, Chairman. There will be opportunity for comments when the draft has been completed.

LC Classification

The fourth edition of Class A, Generalia, has been published and can now be purchased from the Card Division. New editions of Classes C, Auxiliary Sciences of History; U, Military Science; and V, Naval Science, are currently being prepared; the last two should be ready for press early in 1974. Classes B-BJ, Philosophy/Psychology, and H, Social Sciences, are also being revised but will require considerable time before publication. In law classification development Class KD, Law of the United Kingdom and Ireland, has been published and can be purchased. Class KE, Law of Canada, is being prepared in cooperation with the National Library at Ottawa which is represented at LC by Ann Roe, a cataloger from the National Library staff. Work continues on the development of Class K, General Law, and KKC, Law of Germany.

Decimal Classification Activities

Planning and development of the 19th edition of the *Dewey Decimal Classification*, due in 1977 or later, continued apace. The Editorial Policy Committee met in November in LC and studied various specific proposals for the forthcoming edition. Major attention was given to the life sciences, sociology, history and civilization, music, and the forthcoming new local administrative divisions of the United Kingdom that are due to go into effect in April 1974. The classification activities of the Decimal Classification Division, which were at an all-time high for fiscal 1973 (81,474 titles), promised to go a bit higher for fiscal 1974. Covered were nearly all titles cataloged by the Library in English and a selection of those in French and other western languages, especially if included in the MARC record. Cooperation continued with the *British National Bibliography*, and contacts have been made with the *Australian National Bibliography*.

SERIALS

On the basis of production statistics thus far, the descriptive cataloging of serials should rise from 10,000 in fiscal 1973 to nearly 12,000 in fiscal 1974. Procedural changes instituted in September 1973 will result in an increase in data reported to the MARC Development Office. MARC-Serials tapes, previously restricted to roman alphabet serials, will include romanized entries for serials in all non-roman alphabets and characters: Cyrillic, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, etc. The revised procedures will also facilitate the editing of Asian language serials for *New Serial Titles*.

CARD DISTRIBUTION SERVICES

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, the number of orders for catalog cards is projected at approximately 7-1/2 million and the number of cards sold at 59 million.

In June 1973 the Library received permission from the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing to utilize the VideoComp in the Card Division to photocompose all future issues of *Films and Other Materials for Projection*, *Library of Congress Subject Headings* and its *Supplements*, and the *Digest of Public General Bills and Resolutions*. Once photocomposed, the master copy is provided in a film form to the Government Printing Office, where it is developed on a reversal processor and then used to create plates for printing. The first supplement to the 8th edition of *Library of Congress Subject Headings* is now being prepared by the new techniques. This changeover has caused a delay in its preparation; therefore, instead of a January-March quarterly, the first issue will be a semi-annual covering the period January-June 1973. It is tentatively scheduled for publication in early 1974.

In December 1973 a second cutter/collator machine was installed in the Card Division's printing unit. Now undergoing final testing, the implementation of this device should significantly increase the number of photocomposed MARC cards which can be automatically printed, cut, and collated in a sequence predetermined by parameters used in the computer programs.

CARD CATALOGS

Three projects involving the card catalogs were undertaken by the Catalog Management Division during the last half of 1973.

The Far Eastern Languages Catalog in the Orientalia Division was expanded by 240 trays and now contains 660 drawers. Each tray is about half full and the catalog should not need to be enlarged again until sometime after 1976. The shift was completed in November.

The Official Catalog, totaling 20 million cards, was expanded from 19,200 to 25,200 trays with an optimum capacity of 25 million cards. The move was necessary both to alleviate overcrowding now and to provide space for expansion until 1977, the projected date for transfer to the new James Madison Memorial Library Building. In conjunction with the expansion, readability was greatly improved by the installation of fluorescent lighting. The staff of seven divisions had to be relocated to provide the needed space.

In connection with space reassignments in the Reference Department, a card catalog for serials, discontinued since 1969, was reactivated in the Science Reading Room by photographing the currently maintained serials catalog in the Main Reading Room.

BOOK CATALOGS

Quinquennial of the National Union Catalog, 1968-72

Copy for volumes 80 and 81 of the 1968-72 quinquennial of the *National Union Catalog* was shipped in November to the publisher, J. W. Edwards, Inc., Ann Arbor, Mich., bringing to completion some 80 percent of the author list. The 81 volumes completed thus far contain 52,782 pages. At present production rates, the author portion of the quinquennial should be completed in February 1974.

In November, Edwards released the first six volumes of the quinquennial. These volumes carry a limited copyright notice in the name of the American Library Association. Certain entries prepared by libraries other than the Library of Congress are protected by this notice. All appropriate volumes of the quinquennial will receive this copyright protection. The American Library Association will grant the Library of Congress and J. W. Edwards a royalty-free license to publish the protected entries and its NUC Committee is formulating the policies which will govern other licensing arrangements. Future editions of the *NUC* will likewise be copyrighted by the Association.

Register of Additional Locations

Work is also nearing completion on the quinquennial cumulation of the *Register of Additional Locations*. The alphabetical list and the listings for card numbers in series 56 to 67 are being done by manual methods while listings for card numbers 68 to 79 are being done by the newly developed automated system. The editing of the alphabetical list is complete through the letter "R." Page copy preparation has just begun for the manually prepared card number listings, with portions of the arranging and matching of reports yet to be completed in the 62, 63, and 67 card series. Input and program editing of the listings in the automated 68-79 series is complete; for this file, work is now in progress on the addition of card number cross references and on the development of a print program. According to the latest estimate, the 1968-72 *Register* will include over 10.3 million added locations.

Motion Pictures and Filmstrips

Editing of the 1968-72 cumulation of *Motion Pictures and Filmstrips* was complicated by the changes in editorial policy that occurred during the five-year period. Filing of the quinquennial has been completed and reading the trays of the print file began in November. Because of the increased number of films cataloged for *Motion Pictures and Filmstrips* in recent years, this quinquennial will be substantially larger than any previous cumulation.

Library of Congress Catalog-Books: Subjects

The first ten volumes of the 1972 *Books: Subjects* catalog had been sent to the printer by September 18 but shortly thereafter it was discovered that nothing had been done toward printing the catalog because of the paper shortage. Proof copies of the first four volumes were received in November, however, and it now appears that publication can proceed, with the first four volumes going to subscribers early in 1974. Volume 13 of the 15-volume set was sent to the printer November 30, and the last two volumes will be shipped during the first week of December.

The 14,614 pages in this cumulation represent an increase of 34.8 percent over the 10,837 pages of the 1971 annual edition. Similarly, the April-June issue for 1973, which was sent to the printer early in August, contains 2,934 pages, a 16 percent increase over the 1972 quarterly for the same period. The July-September issue, shipped November 14, was 10.8 percent larger than the July-September quarterly for 1972, and overall the three 1973 quarterlies were 18.3 percent larger than the three quarterlies of 1972.

This increase in the number of printed pages reflects two new editorial policies. In May 1972 it was decided that the *Books: Subjects* catalog would henceforth include pre-1945 imprints, which had formerly been excluded; and at the same time the catalog responded to a longfelt need by replacing its former style of card, especially printed to exclude the tracings, with the full-entry ("cumulative") card used by the *National Union Catalog*. While the full-entry cards do require more space on the page, they provide better service to users of the catalog and save the expense of the special printing previously required. The addition of pre-1945 imprints, while not a large quantitative element, gives the catalog complete coverage of all Library of Congress printed cards.

Because 1974 will be the fifth year in a quinquennial period, no annual of *Books: Subjects* will be published for 1974. Planning has now begun for the 1970-74 quinquennial and actual work on it should begin in mid-1974.

Music, Books on Music, and Sound Recordings

Editing of the 1968-72 cumulation of *Music and Phonorecords* was completed early in September; the subject part, containing 1,010 pages, has now been mounted; and mounting of the author section, which will have some 2,700 pages, has begun. Editorial work on the January-June 1973 issue of the expanded catalog, now titled *Music, Books on Music, and Sound Recordings*, has been completed and production of camera copy began in mid-December. Copies should be available to subscribers in February 1974.

Films and Other Materials for Projection

The appearance of the new *Films* catalog has been delayed, but it is now hoped that the first issue, covering the period from October 1972 to June 1973, can be made available early in 1974. Meanwhile, editorial and computer work proceeded on the July-September 1973 issue. It will be ready for the printer early in December and it should appear soon after the first issue.

Newspapers in Microform

Newspapers in Microform: United States, 1948-1972 became available at the end of October 1973. This volume is a cumulation of all the reports contained in the United States sections of earlier editions of *Newspapers on Microfilm* (1948-1967), together with reports received through the summer of 1972. Containing 1,056 pages of text, it reports 34,289 titles in 7,457 localities of the United States and its territories and possessions, as reported by 843 libraries and 48 commercial firms.

Final proof copy of the companion volume, *Newspapers in Microform: Foreign Countries, 1948-1972*, was received on November 27, slightly ahead of schedule, and the publication will be available for purchase early in 1974. It presents 8,850 foreign newspaper titles as reported by 552 libraries and 40 commerical firms.

National Register of Microform Masters

The 1972 *National Register of Microform Masters* went to the printer early in December. Its 1,064 pages give special attention to serials and it is expected that this information will be especially useful to librarians. Editing of the 1973 edition is well advanced, with more than 35,000 reports ready for inclusion. Both volumes should be ready for publication early in 1974.

National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections

The 1971 *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* (Index 1970-71) was published in April 1973. The volume for 1972 (Index 1970-72) is now in press and should appear in the spring of 1974. It describes and indexes 1,900 collections in 744 pages.

Pre-1956 National Union Catalog

On August 4, 1973, the National Union Catalog Publication Project shipped copy for the last of the letter K to the publisher, bringing the editing project to the halfway point. As of December 7, 290 volumes had been published, with coverage through "Key, Ernst." Copy for an additional 28 volumes has been edited and shipped, bringing the total edited volumes to 318 and the total cards edited to 5,619,710. The alphabetic coverage extends through "Lienhard, Emil."

New Catalogs

Additional staff has been authorized for two new publications to be published in 1974. The first, tentatively entitled *Name Headings with References*, will report all name authority cards newly created or newly revised, provided that the authority contains at least one reference. (Names requiring no reference can be verified by referring to the *National Union Catalog*.) The second catalog, tentatively called *Monographic Series*, will list all monographs appearing as parts of series. The arrangement will be by the title of the series and their numerical sequence in the collection if they are part of a numbered series. Cross references will be provided for series titles that are not easily identified. Both of the new publications will be issued quarterly, with an annual cumulation.

MARC DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

Since 1971 the MARC Development Office has been developing plans for the systematic automation of technical processes in the Library of Congress. The original master guidelines for an integrated core bibliographic system (described in "Automation Activities in the Processing Department of the Library of Congress," *Library Resources and Technical Services*, v. 16, no. 2, Spring 1972) is considered Phase I of the project. In August 1973, an internal project status report was completed describing the work done under Phase II. The tasks included calculating the size and growth factor of all files and estimating the requirements for on-line terminals and printers, the transaction load on the system, and the volume of hardware activity (e.g., disk accesses and terminal transmissions).

With the completion of Phase II, Phase III has been initiated to define the core bibliographic system at the next level of detail and, if necessary, to revise the order of implementation of the various modules and the time frame for implementation. The first task, the additional analysis required to compile and manipulate the LC name reference file in machine-readable form, is in progress. The objectives have been defined as: (1) distributing name references for MARC subscribers; (2) providing references for LC book catalogs; (3) providing a cataloging aid and an index to the MARC data base; and (4) using the index of names as a means of validating headings as data are input into the MARC system.

Automation of Technical Processes

Considerable progress has been made on the Multiple Use MARC System (MUMS), which will be capable of using either disk or tapes for peripheral storage and will have on-line and off-line (batch processing) capabilities. MUMS consists of three major components: task control, which provides executive control of the system; message control, which consists of two compatible sets of input/output programs called terminal support and batch support; and data management, which handles files on disks. The final version of task control is operational. On-line terminal support is now supporting two preliminary cathode ray tube (CRT) terminals and dial-up typewriter terminals. Batch support has been implemented. The first version of the data management programs that will store and retrieve bibliographic records by LC card number is being integrated with the rest of MUMS.

A contract has been awarded to Four-Phase Systems Company for additional CRT terminals. Also, arrangements are being made with the telephone company to install Model 37 Teletypes as printer terminals. Installation of both these devices is scheduled for the spring of 1974. Requests for expression of interest have also been issued to potential vendors of bar code printer and status reading device terminals for support of the Automated Process Information File (APIF) project.

The first application scheduled to operate under MUMS in fiscal 1974 is the redesign of the MARC input system at LC. The first phase will allow on-line corrections to MARC records and the ability to create records on-line with the master file remaining on tape. Subsequent phases include the conversion of the master file from tape to disk, file control through MUMS data management programs, and conversion of other types of materials to operate under MUMS. Considerable progress has been made on definitions and design for the support of the second MUMS application, the Automated Process Information File.

The initial phase of the APIF project will include input of current English-language imprints processed by the Preliminary Cataloging Section of the Descriptive Cataloging Division. Programming to provide the capabilities to do on-line searching, inputting, and updating of APIF records, and on-line printing of the manuscript worksheet is in progress. The devices to be used for on-line status/location reporting are presently being determined. In order to facilitate training of preliminary catalogers in on-line searching and to make use of the MARC file for identifying duplicate titles, an on-line file of abbreviated MARC records will be provided in advance of the implementation of APIF.

Subsequent phases of the APIF project will expand coverage to other languages, the other cataloging divisions, and other forms of material; expand search capabilities beyond the initial LC card number, author/title, and title search keys; and allow input of machine-readable files from the Order Division, foreign national bibliographies, and possibly other sources for searching and/or updating an APIF record. APIF records for appropriate materials, in turn, will be updated to become MARC records.

The MARC Development Office is also involved in the automation of the acquisition processes in the Processing Department. During October 1973, the Order Division Automated System was renamed the Library Order Information System (LOIS). Work is now in progress on the third of four scheduled tasks. This third task, scheduled for implementation in January 1974, will bring under automated control all Order Division records pertaining to purchase subscriptions. Previously completed tasks have provided automated control of all Order Division records pertaining to regular orders. The completion of the third task will provide permanent machine-readable files of all Order Division order records and the capability to use the collected data to provide management information for the Order Division. On completion of the third task, work will begin on the fourth task, fiscal control.

Machine-Readable Cataloging and Related Activities

The use of machine-readable catalog records has increased with the corresponding rise in the number of records in the MARC data bases. The Library presently has available in machine-readable form approximately 403,125 records for books (English-and French-language monographs, and Cataloging in Publication titles), 15,100 film records, 5,000 map records, and 3,300 records for serials. As noted in another portion of this report, the Card Division can produce printed cards on their photocomposition device from all of these MARC records, with the exception of serials. Serials processing cannot be handled until the Card Division obtains additional core for their computer. In addition, the number of monthly machine searches in the data base has increased one third in the last six months and has doubled in the last year. The new monthly searches include titles on library and information science, titles on the study and teaching of children's literature, titles pertaining to Latin American studies to assist in the compilation of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, and titles having the LC call number for geology.

Another important use of MARC records is in the production of book catalogs. Catalogs containing monograph and serial titles in the Main Reading Room and Science Reading Room reference collections will be prepared in 1974 on a computer line printer after the updating of the machine records has been completed. Preliminary catalogs for both collections had been prepared earlier.

Format recognition, a technique which allows the computer to process unedited cataloging data to create a complete MARC record, has been used by the MARC Editorial Division for input of all English-language monographs since January 1972. Although LC does not expect to implement the rules for the International Standard Bibliographic Description until 1974, the MARC Development Office has completed the changes needed for the format recognition programs to process English-language monographs cataloged according to the ISBD. Portions of format recognition have also been modified in order to process French-language monographs according to the ISBD.

The Office has also completed the conversion of subject heading data into a MARC format and created a single machine-readable file consisting of data from the seventh edition of the LC subject headings list merged with data from all of the supplements through December 1972. The resulting file for the eighth edition is being proofread and corrected where necessary by the Editorial Section, Subject Cataloging Division.

Since January 1973, the Editorial Section has been keying data directly into the automated subject headings maintenance system. These records are being accumulated on a data base in order to publish the quarterly supplement to the eighth edition. Beginning with the second quarter 1973 supplement, the Card Division will be photocomposing these publications from the MARC subject headings file.

Staff members in the MARC Development Office have also been serving in an advisory capacity to divisions in the Reference Department that are creating specialized machine-readable data bases. The Motion Picture Section of the Prints and Photographs Division is nearing completion of a pilot project to convert film records for two collections into machine-readable form. Assistance has also been provided to the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped in converting catalog records for open-reel tapes to machine-readable form.

Publications

The Office has continued its efforts to disseminate information on its activities through the Library's publication program. *National Aspects of Creating and Using MARC/RECON Records* contains the results of studies conducted by the RECON Working Task Force. This publication is a companion volume to the *Final Report of the RECON Pilot Project.* Both publications are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office. A second edition of *Serials: A MARC Format* is in press and will be available through the GPO.

MARC EDITORIAL DIVISION

The burden of backlogs has been banished by the MARC Editorial Division. By the end of the last fiscal year, a seemingly insurmountable backlog of 10,000 in-process titles had been reduced to 3,000 and shortly thereafter to a continuing level of about 1,500. As a result, the conversion of catalog records for English and French language books and new and revised films has been performed on a current basis for the past six months. To provide a cushion of additional work on days of low receipts, 15,680 popular titles (those titles ordered most frequently from the Card Division) have been processed. These records are now available for sale by the Card Division on a separate tape as Popular Titles, Part II. The processing of 48,000 MARC I records has also begun. During the MARC Pilot Project a less complex format than the MARC II format was used. These records are now being updated to full MARC II status. So far, approximately 6,000 MARC I's have been processed.

As part of the preparation for the implementation of the Multiple Use MARC System, verifiers are participating in tests of the cathode ray tube terminal in order to determine response time, the efficiency of the programs to accomplish certain transactions, and the mechanical workability of the terminal. Such testing will continue until Phase I of MUMS begins.

TECHNICAL PROCESSES RESEARCH OFFICE ACTIVITIES

The Technical Processes Research Office is engaged in a study of dynamic file growth. So far, most descriptive studies of LC files (e.g., authority files, the Process Information File) have been, in effect, studies of static files; or, to be more precise, they have been studies of dynamic files in a static state, that is, at one point in time. Experience has shown that inferences drawn exclusively from such data can be quite misleading. This is because almost all LC files result from the accretion of records over many years and relatively recent changes in policy and practice may have caused the characteristics of current input to differ significantly from those of the files as they stand. Therefore, to plan for development of the automated Core Bibliographic System, which is more concerned with going forward than looking back, a clearer idea of how these files are actually growing is needed.

A critical question concerns the extent of duplication among headings (whether name or subject) used on current catalog records in both the short term and the long term. To elucidate this problem, TPR is trying to build a model from sample data to show how a subject index to the MARC data base might grow over a five-year period. Also under study is the incidence of one-shot headings, those used only once during the period under study.

As part of its investigation of dynamic file activity, TPR is continuing its studies of the performance of 3-3 (author-title) search keys. Attention is currently centered on the extent to which the number of responses is influenced by the fact that the language of the record being searched is different from the predominant languages in a data base.

A state-of-the-art study of man/machine interface in interactive systems has been initiated at the request of the MARC Development Office. The objective is to provide guidelines for the design of an optimum user environment for the on-line MARC system now being developed. The first stage of the TPR study will consist of a review of the literature on man/machine interface with particular emphasis on experience gained in established systems and the criteria for evaluating this aspect of their operation.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS OFFICE

The Information Systems Office continued to develop automated systems which affect many areas of activity of the Library. Improvements in computer service were made possible by the installation of a second computer and the application of generalized computer programs to a variety of processes. The activities of the three major offices within ISO are described by the kinds of systems developed and implemented. In addition to direct computer support, activities increased markedly in the planning for the Madison Memorial Library Building, to include studies on the short and long-term potential for data communications activities in the building.

System Development and Standards Office

During the past six months, ISO continued to work toward bringing about a more effective use of automation resources. Seminar and training sessions provided automation personnel with information necessary for such utilization of resources. Data communications and network design were emphasized because of their importance in current teleprocessing applications as well as in future plans for the Madison Building. Information was distributed internally to keep the staff informed of current developments. Necessary adjustments to the computer configuration and operational procedures were made as conditions warranted. A major development was the installation of software support for the second computer installed in October 1973. The operating system is a new product which uses a technique known as "virtual storage": OS/VS1 manages expensive computer memory more efficiently than could previously operating systems.

A measure of growth in teleprocessing activities is seen in the additions made to the Customer Information Control System (CICS), the primary teleprocessing support software. During the past six months, seven new applications developed by groups in the Information Systems Office and the MARC Development Office have been incorporated into CICS production. The total number of CICS applications has doubled within the past six months.

Computer Service Center

During the past six months the Computer Service Center has undergone many changes in the areas of computer hardware and work handling procedures. The increase of computer applications, particularly in teleprocessing activities, required that computer capacity and backup capability be increased. A second computer, therefore, was installed in October to improve the quality of data processing services to computer users. Additional disk storage devices were also acquired to increase the amount of data which can be accessed and to increase cost effectiveness.

CRT display devices were installed in the Personnel Operations Office, American Law, Science and Technology, and the Loan Divisions. Additional terminals were also installed in the U.S. Senate. In order to improve the response time for terminal users, the multi-point telephone line was redistributed among users.

The paper shortage continued to be of direct concern. Because of potential shortages in computer ribbons, magnetic tape, disk packs, and other essential components, steps were taken to provide sufficient lead time for ordering these items.

Computer Applications Office

Computer support to the Congressional Research Service (CRS) and to the Congress continued to grow with emphasis on expanding on-line retrieval capabilities in the Legislative Information Display System which provides access to *Bill Digest* data and citations to current legislation (see Congressional Research Service below).

Reference Department automation activities were highlighted by an interim system to support the automated maintenance of a portion of the Central Charge file of the Loan Division. Automation support of a broader range of Loan Division activities is being developed concurrently. The first phase of the Order Control System for the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (DBPH) is nearing completion. The system in DBPH will have the on-line capability for entry of data, for updating information in the file, and for querying the data base, as well as the capability for producing all necessary documentation.

Automation activities in the Copyright Office included the completion of design and programming specifications for the publication and cataloging system under development. The preparation of *Catalogs of Copyright Entries* in microform was begun including Class N data.

Camera-ready copy of formatted statistical reports was presented to the Federal Library Committee (FLC) in connection with ISO's participation in the Survey of Federal Libraries (1972). Over 1,500 federal libraries responded to the FLC questionnaire and ISO provided a variety of statistical measurements.

Efforts continued in the promotion of utility software for a variety of applications. The SPECOL software system installed during the first six months of 1973 continued to be used to extract data for special reports from the Personnel Data File, the Employee Address File, and the CRS Inquiry Control File. As an alternative to paper products, generalized software was developed to support the production of microfiche or microfilm. Currently, the program is used to produce the MARC Print Index Listing on microfiche.

PRESERVATION ACTIVITIES

The most unusual event in which t[illegible]rvation Office was involved during the pa[illegible]hs was the disastrous fire in the Military [illegible] Records Center outside of St. Louis, Mo., which occurred on July 12. Within hours after the fire started, the Archivist of the United States had requested the assistance of LC's Preservation staff. Two staff members were in St. Louis the next day and spent the next two weeks assisting and advising in the salvage operation. Recovery of these records is now going on successfully as a result of collaboration between LC staff and the technical experts of the McDonnell Douglass Aircraft Corporation, which made available a large vacuum drying chamber formerly used in the space program.

One of the most fundamental and most complex tasks in the conservation of library materials is the development of mass treatments by means of which large quantities of damaged or deteriorated materials may be treated en masse or in a "production line" operation without the sacrifice of conservation expertise or quality which these words might imply. One such development, which has taken place in Europe, is the invention of what is known as leaf-casting equipment. This machine enables conservators to repair paper documents, fill holes or voids, and restore lost margins much more effectively and many times more rapidly than these same tasks can be accomplished manually. The best known and most fully developed leaf-casting machine is produced by the Yissum Research Institute of the Hebrew National Library in Jerusalem. LC ordered such a machine last year and took delivery in early November. Since then the Restoration Office staff has already demonstrated its value and made a number of improvements. This initial period has been largely experimental, but the equipment is expected to go into routine use early in the new year.

During the same period, the Research Office Laboratory has been involved in a number of projects including the testing and evaluation for the Council on Library Resources of a new vapor-phase deacidification and buffering treatment for brittle books. John C. Williams, Research Officer, has completed and submitted for publication an article describing a new theory relating to the MIT Folding Endurance Test. Similarly, Dr. Williams' work on the vapor phase treatment of paper with di-ethyl zinc has been developed to the point at which the fundamentals of the treatment are known and there is evidence that the process can be successfully applied to paper. Further work remains to be done, but the results to date are promising.

The laboratory is carrying forward several other projects including a comprehensive evaluation of presently known or proposed methods of deacidifying paper, depolymerization as a means of evaluating the deterioration of paper, stain identification and removal, and similar projects.

One of the most important events of the past six months was a lecture on December 10 by Dr. Romuald Kowalik, Chief of the Microbiological Section of the Institute for Industrial Organic Chemistry in Warsaw. Dr. Kowalik is one of the world experts on the microflora of library and archival materials and his lecture summed up his twenty-five years of work in this field. Much of the material is new and unpublished and represents a significant contribution to the field. The Library of Congress will publish Dr. Kowalik's paper as part of its proposed new series devoted to the conservation of library and archival materials.

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE

Phase II of a four-phase Laboratory renovation project has been completed in the Photoduplication Service. The staff and equipment dislocations necessitated by this program to improve physical facilities and working conditions were accomplished with a minimum of disruption of work flow or delay in filling public orders.

Specifications for the Microfilming of Books and Pamphlets in the Library of Congress, the second in a series of four microfilming specifications planned by the Photoduplication Service, was printed by the GPO in November 1973. These new *Specifications* are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 for 40 cents a copy (Stock no. 3000-00068).

The Service continues to issue circulars describing recently filmed publications deemed to be of scholarly interest. Notable among those sent during the last half of 1973 announced Russia's *Istoricheskii Viestnik* (1880-1917); two British suffragist serials, *Votes for Women* (1907-1918) and *Britannia* (1912-1918); and, Romania's *Monitorul Oficial* (1867, 1874, 1876, 1882-1913).

FEDERAL LIBRARY COMMITTEE

The Federal Library Committee has continued its active program directed toward the following broad objectives: (1) to achieve wider and improved utilization of library resources and facilities; (2) to provide more effective planning, development, and operation of Federal libraries; and (3) to promote an optimum exchange of experience, skill, and resources among Federal librarians. With the assistance of research and development grants for specific contractual studies, work groups composed of Federal librarians have directed programs and projects in a variety of areas, with emphasis the past year on reorganization, automation, and education and training. On June 29, 1973, FLC entered into a cooperative agreement with the Ohio College Library Center to experiment with interfacing and connecting the OCLC data base and existing supporting systems to a national automated telecommunications service system which will provide user Federal libraries with on-line access to the OCLC data base through local telephone connections and which will provide each user library with on-line cataloging data and printed catalog cards in individualized formats. Initially, twelve libraries have joined together in providing the resources necessary for this experiment. Other Federal libraries both within and outside the Washington metropolitan area may also participate. Because of technical and other problems, the leased line from Washington to Columbus, Ohio, has been delayed; present indications are that it will be operational in January 1974.

The FLC Task Force on Recruitment developed a qualifications rating scale for use with applications under the Civil Service Commission's GS 1410 (librarian) series. This scale was accepted and implemented. A self-coding scheme for use by the Commission in expanding the GS-14 register was also developed.

The fourth executive workshop, planned and administered by the FLC Education Task Force, brought together librarians from various areas and particularly from western States for sessions on a wide range of library administrative issues.

Frank Kurt Cylke left the Federal Library Committee in July to become Chief of the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. James P. Riley, University Librarian at Marquette University, was appointed Executive Director and will assume full responsibility on January 7, 1974. He will also serve as Chairman of the U.S. National Libraries Task Force on Cooperative Activities.

U.S. NATIONAL LIBRARIES TASK FORCE ON COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES

The U.S. National Libraries Task Force continued to rotate its monthly meetings among the three national libraries. The Task Force concentrated on strengthening cooperation in acquisitions, cataloging, automation, and service of materials. It issued documents on the "Acquisitions Responsibilities of the Three U.S. National Libraries" and "Cooperative Agreements and Arrangements" involving the National Agricultural Library, the National Library of Medicine, and the Library of Congress. The latter reviews the formal and ad hoc arrangements for cooperation that have been developed in the interest of efficiency, economy, and elimination of duplication of effort to the fullest degree possible.

A contractual study on subscription dealer performance involved review of services that are or could be provided to libraries by subscription dealers, such as central placement of orders, handling of supplemental charges, and claiming. On the basis of service data collected from subscription agents, the contractor developed a checklist of services appropriate for libraries to expect from their agents and a mechanism to ensure agents' compliance with service agreements.

A committee of representatives from the three libraries consulted with publishers, dealers, and librarians about the need for a Standard Order Form. This work has been expanded to meet the needs of the wider community, and several professional groups have lent their support to the development and implementation of this standard. A corresponding project still under study is the need for a Standard Book Order Format, involving use of an identification code for book orders which would include the ISBN as one part of the number.

Other projects include a joint study on computer readable input, investigation of the pros and cons of centralized storage facilities, and surveys concerning preservation of materials in the three libraries.

NATIONAL SERIALS DATA PROGRAM

The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for fiscal

1974 included funding for 9 positions and $133,000 as the Library of Congress share in support of the National Serials Data Program (NSDP). The NSDP is a cooperative program of the National Library of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library, and LC.

As its primary task for the national libraries, the NSDP has processed for inclusion in its data bases the current serial cataloging data for the three libraries. At the end of calendar 1973 the serial data base includes 5,200 records for newly cataloged serials reported by the three libraries, as well as 6,300 author headings in the Corporate Authority File. This latter data base includes the form of heading used by NSDP as well as related headings used by the three libraries.

In addition, the NSDP has prepared a proposal to develop a large core data base of 60,000 serial titles in science and technology. This proposal is being submitted for funding by an agency outside of the three libraries and it is planned to implement this project early in calendar year 1974.

The International Organization for Standardization Technical Committee 46 (ISO TC46) in late October submitted the Draft International Standard ISO/DIS 3297–Documentation-International standard serial numbering (ISSN) to the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Z39 Committee for ratification. The NSDP has been instrumental in the development of this international standard.

The NSDP has also played a prime role as the leading national member in the development of the International Serials Data System's (ISDS) *Guidelines for ISDS*, published in mid-1973. The ISDS is the implementing mechanism for the ISSN as an international standard and the *Guidelines* provides the detailed specifications not included in the standard. The ISDS, in addition to the U.S. National Center (NSDP) and an International Center in Paris, now has national centers in Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Japan, and a COMECON regional center in the U.S.S.R.

The ISDS represents the primary element of UNESCO's UNISIST program in its efforts to establish a world science information system. The Director of NSDP is a member of the UNISIST Working Group on Bibliographic Data Interchange which is looking into the feasibility of achieving compatibility among the various internationally utilized bibliographic standards and systems.

The NSDP is also concerned with national developments in the establishment of a uniform system of bibliographic control over serial publications. A group of serial librarians and systems librarians organized an ad hoc Discussion Group on Serials Data Bases and held its first meeting at the ALA meeting in Las Vegas. Staff of NSDP attended that first as well as subsequent meetings and have been working closely with the Group in all areas.

PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS PROGRAM

The microfilm of the Woodrow Wilson Papers (540 reels) and an accompanying three-volume *Index to the Woodrow Wilson Papers* have been issued. The James A. Garfield Papers film (177 reels) and a one-volume *Index* are to be available in January 1974, with the film and *Index* for Thomas Jefferson to follow in the spring.

NATIONAL UNION CATALOG REFERENCE SERVICE

For the six-month period ending November 30, 1973, the Union Catalog Reference Unit (UCRU) received 28,315 requests for locations and bibliographic information, an increase of nearly 13 percent over the previous six-month period.

Widespread application of the 1973 manual, *The National Union Catalog: Reference and Related Services*, and the use of standard forms have resulted in more carefully prepared and uniform inquiries, better screening, and the greater utilization of local, State, and regional resources. Nearly all mail inquiries employ the single-title forms which, like the manual, are available from UCRU; teletype requests are usually sent in the new format with which institutions have reported surprisingly few problems.

FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILMING

The third issue of *Foreign Newspaper Report* prepared by the Reference Department's Office of the Coordinator of Foreign Newspaper Microfilming, was distributed in November, completing the first full year of publication. This *Report* is sent to more than 800 libraries, research institutions, area studies associations, and commercial micropublishers throughout the world. Plans are now underway to expand the publication's coverage to include information about the acquisition and microfilming of foreign gazettes, as well as foreign newspapers.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DIVISION

The move of the Science Reading Room into the central fifth-floor area formerly occupied by the Annex catalog was completed in December. This new Science Reading Room provides about the same linear shelf space for the reference collection as did the old one, and accommodates about the same number of readers. The division's two free-distribution series publications have maintained their popularity, in particular the *LC Science Tracer Bullet* titles dealing with energy alternatives (solar and geothermal engery and wind power) and the informal National Referral Center "selected list" on petroleum and natural gas; all of these, incidentally, antedated by at least a few months the broad public awareness of the energy crisis. The revised *Social Sciences* volume in the NRC series *A Directory of Information Resources in the United States* was published in July, and the revised *Federal Government* volume is in press. Also in press is a chronology on the Wright Brothers. In addition, the division continued to provide text for publications issued by other agencies, including *Astronautics and Aeronautics: Chronology on Science, Technology, and Policy*, published by NASA, and the *Bibliography on Cold Regions Science and Technology* published by the Army's Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory (CRREL). For the latter, camera copy for volume 27 and five-year cumulated author and subject indexes covering volumes 23 through 27 were produced on the Library's computer. A continuing task is the verification of entries for a revised edition of *A Guide to the World's Abstracting and Indexing Services in Science and Technology* being compiled jointly by the National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services and the International Federation for Documentation.

A video-display terminal and printer connected online to the AEC-RECON data-base complex in Oak Ridge, Tenn., was installed in the division in November. The first major data base readied for access through the terminal was *Nuclear Science Abstracts;* the great convenience of the device was soon evident, notably in a reduction in search time for various bibliographic and reference applications. Meanwhile, the division is awaiting the conversion to searchable status of several division data bases, including a new merged NRC corpus and the Polar Bibliographic Data Base, for access through another computer terminal. On the *Antarctic Bibliography*, the many technical details relating to its planned photocomposition were being worked out with LC's Publications and Information Systems Offices and the Government Printing Office in the hope that volume 6 can be put on the Linotron. The retrospective conversion of volumes 1 through 5 into machine-readable form was completed, but substantial editing is still required before cumulative indexes can be compiled. ATS keyboarding of the 10,000 titles already coded under the Science Serials project is progressing slowly on a time-available basis.

SERVICES TO THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

The national network of libraries serving blind and physically handicapped readers increased to the largest size ever recorded in the six-month period ending December 31, 1973, to a grand total of 53. Two new regional libraries were established (Idaho and South Carolina), as were five new subregional libraries in three States. The latter are community libraries under auspices of the regional libraries in the States, which normally provide talking book service primarily to eligible readers within their respective jurisdictions. Readers of cassette books produced by the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, and circulated by the network libraries, has risen 600 percent from fiscal 1970, when cassette books were introduced by the Division, through the end of fiscal 1973.

Support and promotion of sound growth and development in the national network represents a primary goal of the Division, the predominant producer and supplier of library materials and playback equipment to qualified readers at no cost through the network of cooperating libraries. Several members of the Division staff, in addition to giving consultation on program development and management during visits to cooperating libraries, participated as resource persons in three 1973 regional conferences planned and sponsored by network participants.

An experienced administrator of national and local library programs, Frank Kurt Cylke, received appointment as Chief of the division effective July 9, 1973, to succeed Robert S. Bray who retired. Another appointment, that of Steven J. Herman, former New Jersey regional librarian, to be head of the Division's National Collections Section, effective December 24, 1973, completed the filling of vacancies in the Division's critical management positions.

Fiscal 1974 appropriations provided for two entirely new activities by the division: the development of a national automated bibliographic service for library materials for blind and physically handicapped readers, and for the establishment of two multi-State centers, as depositories and servicers for braille materials and playback equipment. The division proceeded with plans to have contracts awarded for establishing and operating the centers, and to develop a blueprint and lay a foundation for the first-time automated bibliographic service.

To cope with shortages of electronic components, plastics essential to the production of discs and magnetic tape, paper products, and other materials critical to the program, the division took steps to make use of all extant models of playback equipment, among other actions. Another important move in the direction of the best use of available resources was an arrangement with the Association of Research Libraries for the division to participate in the ARL-developed Management Review and Analysis Program. The division's participation marks the first time that a library organization other than a research library, for whom the program was designed, has become involved in the enterprise. The program is a seven-month self-study and examination of management, utilizing tools and materials developed by the ARL Office of University Library Management Studies, in addition to ARL-provided training sessions and consultation.

An intensified effort was made to find and reach eligible readers and to seek out reader response to program plans and activities. A special study was carried out to determine more precisely the total number of individuals in the country who are potentially eligible for the program. Division staff also held meetings with representatives of several organized groups of blind and handicapped persons for an exchange of views on library needs and services. A growing number of public agencies are seeking division and network assistance in meeting the information needs of their respective clients and patrons who are blind and physically handicapped.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

The traditional services of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) were expanded in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 in order to provide the Congress with massive aid in policy analysis. The present functions of the Service can be broken down into several categories: policy analysis and research, documentation and status of legislation, and information support and reference services. The main thrust of CRS activity is to provide direct and rapid response to the diverse information needs of the Members of Congress, the Congressional Committees, and Congressional staffs. During the first half of the present fiscal year, CRS has answered more than 90,000 inquiries from Congress.

As part of a continuing effort to assure that the best information is readily available to the CRS research staff and to the Congress, the Service has been developing a variety of new services and products which take advantage of the existing bibliographic and bill digest data bases as well as the projected development of an issue briefing system which will contain short analytical summaries of major public policy concerns. These data bases can be queried on line via cathode ray tube (CRT) terminals which have associated print capabilities.

At the beginning of 1973 the bill digest data base, which has been used for the last several years in the preparation of the CRS publication—the *Digest of Public General Bills and Resolutions*, could be accessed by the CRT either directly by bill number or indirectly by bill sponsor, co-sponsor, committee, or a broad subject term. This data base contains 93rd Congress legislation—House and Senate bills introduced since January 1973.

The CRS bibliographic data base began in 1969 and contains citations in modified MARC format to select articles drawn from over 4,000 serial publications, as well as Congressional publications, government documents and a variety of reports, pamphlets, and selected CRS research reports. The primary focus of this data base is to provide information support to the full range of public policy and legislative activity. This data base has been used to generate a weekly Selective Dissemination of Information Service (SDI) to the CRS research staff and to Congress in addition to book catalogs and retrospective bibliographies. Approximately 50,000 citations input during 1972 and 1973 are now available via CRT. During this initial stage it is possible to access the files by using: citation numbers; topical, personal, corporate, or geographic descriptors; personal or corporate authors; or the broad subject terms used to create the SDI.

At the direction of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, CRS is developing a new data base containing very concise, objective summaries of approximately 200 major issues. Each briefing paper will contain a brief analysis, a listing of major relevant legislation, and a short bibliography of significant works on the topic. These issue areas will be carefully monitored so that new developments can be reflected in the briefing paper which will be displayed on a CRT or provided in hard copy on request.

An additional new service takes advantage of the MARC data base created by the Processing Department of the Library of Congress to provide the CRS research staff with a Selective Dissemination of Information Service on a bi-weekly basis. This is a useful supplement to the CRS SDI system, which includes very few monographs and no trade books.

In addition to the computer based information transfer going on in CRS, the last six months has included the old fashioned people-talking-with-people kind of information transfer. The Congressional Research Service in cooperation with the Brookings Institution's Advanced Study Program continued to sponsor seminars on public policy issues. The seminars for Members of Congress during this period covered economic policies and controls, food scarcity, consumer protection, and the media and the government. A similar series of seminars covering budget reform and legislation affecting the status of women, was held for the Congressional staff. During the same time a series of speaker forums for the CRS staff presented information on the equal rights amendments, newsmen's privileges, and Congressional Committee structure and functioning.

The revised and updated edition of *The Constitution of the United States of America–Analysis and Interpretation* is expected to be available from the Government Printing Office early in the new year. The volume contains 1,990 pages and will cost $20.50.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL PROGRAM

Two publications issued from the American Revolution Bicentennial Program in December: *The Fundamental Testaments of the American Revolution* ($3.50), a volume containing the papers delivered at the Library's second symposium on the American Revolution, May 10-11, 1973; and *Two Rebuses from the American Revolution* ($2.50), a facsimile of Matthew Darly's 1778 caricature, representing Great Britain and America as a mother and child disputing. Both may be ordered prepaid from the Library's Information Office.

Leadership in the American Revolution is the topic of the third symposium in the LC series. It will be held in the Coolidge Auditorium, May 9-10, 1974. Lyman H. Butterfield, editor of *The Adams Papers*, will be chairman. Professor Alfred H. Kelly, Wayne State University, will open the symposium with an address on Leadership in American History. Professor Marcus Cunliffe, University of Sussex, England, will analyze Congressional Leadership in the American Revolution, and Professor Gordon Wood, Brown University, will discuss Intellectual Leadership in the American Revolution. Professor Don Higginbotham, University of North Carolina, will speak on Military Leadership in the American Revolution and Professor Bruce Mazlish, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, will discuss American Revolutionary Leadership: The Psychological Dimension. The symposium is free and is open to the public; registration may be made by writing to the Library's American Revolution Bicentennial Office.

Beginning in March 1974 copy for the first volume of the *Letters of the Delegates to Congress, 1774-1789,* will be submitted to the Library's Publications Office. This volume will be the first fruit of the American Revolution Bicentennial Office's ambitious project to locate and edit all of the letters and other documents relating to the Continental Congress and the Congress of the Confederation that their members produced. It is anticipated that 18,000 documents will be published in 25 volumes.

The manuscript of *Revolutionary America, 1763-1789, a Bibliography* is near completion. This comprehensive listing of published primary and secondary sources, covering periodical articles and a selection of contemporary pamphlets as well as books issued through 1972, will contain about 12,000 entries, 3,000 of them annotated.

A guide to the Library's drawings and prints from the period of the American Revolution, as well as a guide to the Library's manuscripts from the same period, are in press. Work is progressing rapidly on a checklist to the Library's maps of the Revolutionary period.

OTHER LC PUBLICATIONS

Never a simple operation at best, the production of government publications has become increasingly difficult in the past year. The editorial work demanded by scholarly manuscripts has increased in volume with the preparation of major guides, compilations, and facsimiles in observance of the

Bicentennial of the American Revolution. This program, combined with simultaneous preparation of such major works as the catalogs of the Rosenwald, Kraus, and Harkness collections, demands a highly concentrated effort.

The most pressing of the current problems arise after the manuscript has left the editor's hands. Since both the Government Printing Office and commercial printers are faced with shortages of certain types of papers and binding cloths, specifications must allow for more than one choice. At times, the alternatives are below the first choice in quality and suitability. The energy crisis will also affect the availability of pigments used in printing inks, and suppliers are forecasting limitations in the choice of colors. Actual printing time for jobs going through the GPO has lengthened considerably.

Nevertheless, since the last semiannual report the Library has published, in addition to those previously mentioned, the *Guide to the History of Cartography*, volume seven of *A List of Geographical Atlases*, *Spanish-Speaking Africa*, *Africana Acquisitions*, and *A Revised Guide to the Law & Legal Literature of Mexico*. Thirty-seven out-of-print literary lectures given at the Library by such outstanding figures as Thomas Mann, T. S. Eliot, Stephen Spender, Richard Wilbur, Mackinlay Kantor, Lin Yutang, Saul Bellow, and others were reissued in one volume, selling for $7 at the GPO bookstore, $7.55 domestic, postpaid. A two-disc recording, *The Hammons Family*, accompanied by a substantial text that discusses the history and traditions of this West Virginia family as well as its music, was prepared by the Archive of Folk Song with the cooperation of the Recorded Sound Section.

Sources in France for the study of American history, with particular emphasis on the Revolutionary period, were featured in the October 1973 *Quarterly Journal*, fitting in nicely with an article on recent acquisitions of the Manuscript Division and a copiously illustrated piece on the Historic American Buildings Survey, which has reached its 40th anniversary.

The lecture of Erik Haugaard, translator of a new complete edition of the tales of Hans Christian Andersen, on the occasion marking the tenth anniversary of the Children's Book Section is now in press as a pamphlet publication of the Library of Congress.

APPENDIX Q

ATTENDANCE AT 83RD MEETING

University of Alabama Libraries
James F. Wyatt

University of Alberta Library
Bruce Peel

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
Donald W. Koepp

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University Libraries
Donald K. Nelson

University of British Columbia Library
Basil Stuart-Stubbs

University of California Library,
(Berkeley) Richard Dougherty

University of California Library
(Davis) J. R. Blanchard

University of California Library
(Los Angeles) Page Ackerman

University of California Library
(San Diego) Melvin J. Voigt

University of California Library
(Santa Barbara) Donald C. Davidson

Center for Research Libraries
Gordon R. Williams

University of Chicago Library
Stanley McElderry

University of Colorado Library
Ellsworth Mason

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
G. F. Shepherd, Jr.

Dartmouth College Libraries
Edward C. Lathem

Duke University Libraries
Benjamin E. Powell

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
Charles E. Miller

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
Warren N. Boes

Harvard University Library
Douglas W. Bryant

Howard University Libraries
Stanton F. Biddle

University of Illinois Library
Lucien W. White

Indiana University Libraries
W. Carl Jackson

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

Iowa State University Library
Warren Kuhn

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
John H. Berthel

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kansas Library
David W. Heron

University of Kentucky Libraries
Paul A. Willis

Library of Congress
John Lorenz

Louisiana State University Library
Richard Klenk

McGill University Library
Richard A. Farley

University of Maryland Library
Howard Rovelstad

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard J. Talbot

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Libraries Natalie N. Nicholson

University of Michigan Library
Frederick H. Wagman

Michigan State University Library
Richard E. Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Ralph H. Hopp

National Agricultural Library
Joseph F. Caponio

National Library of Canada
Joseph Guy Sylvestre

National Library of Medicine
Melvin Day

University of Nebraska Libraries
Kathryn Lundy

New York Public Library
Richard W. Couper

New York State Library
John A. Humphry

New York University Libraries
Eugene P. Kennedy

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
David E. Sparks

Ohio State University Libraries
Hugh Atkinson

University of Oklahoma Library
James K. Zink

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
H. W. Axford

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Library
Glenora E. Rossell

Princeton University Library
William S. Dix

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Rice University Library
Richard L. O'Keeffe

University of Rochester Libraries
Ben C. Bowman

Rutgers University Library
Virginia Whitney

St. Louis University Library
Mary Grathwol

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Russell Shank

Southern Illinois University Library
Ralph E. McCoy

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries Eldred Smith

Syracuse University Library
Metod M. Milac

Temple University Library
Arthur Hamlin

University of Tennessee Libraries
Richard W. Boss

University of Texas Libraries
Merle N. Boylan

Texas A & M University Library
John B. Smith

University of Toronto Libraries
David G. Esplin

Tulane University Library
John H. Gribbin

University of Utah Library
Roger K. Hanson

University of Virginia Libraries
Kenneth G. Peterson

University of Washington Library
Nina Cohen

Washington State University Library
G. Donald Smith

Washington University Libraries
William H. Kurth

Wayne State University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph H. Treyz

Yale University Libraries
Rutherford D. Rogers

ARL Staff:

Stephen A. McCarthy	Executive Director
Suzanne Frankie	Assistant Executive Director
Duane E. Webster	Director, Office of University Library Management Studies
Jeffrey Gardner	Management Research Specialist

Guests

Thomas R. Buckman, The Foundation Center
Fred Cole, Council on Library Resources
Robert Grey Cole, University of North Carolina, Greensboro
Herman Fussler, University of Chicago
Elizabeth Hamer Kegan, Library of Congress
Lawrence Livingston, Council on Library Resources
Beverly P. Lynch, Association of College and Research Libraries/ALA
Keyes D. Metcalf
Foster Mohrhardt, Council on Library Resources
James P. Riley, Federal Library Committee
James E. Skipper, Kraus-Thomson
Charles Stevens, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

Members Not Represented:

Brown University Library
Case Western Reserve University Libraries
University of Cincinnati Libraries
Linda Hall Library
University of Missouri Library
University of Southern California Library

APPENDIX R

COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES*

January 1974

ARL COMMISSIONS

1. Commission on Development of Resources
   Gustave Harrer, Chairman (Jan. 1977)
2. Commission on Organization of Resources
   William Budington, Chairman (Jan. 1975)
3. Commission on Access to Resources
   Virginia Whitney, Chairman (Jan. 1976)
4. Commission on Management of Research Libraries
   Stanley McElderry, Chairman (Jan. 1976)
5. Commission on External Affairs
   William S. Dix, Chairman (Jan. 1977)

STANDING COMMITTEES

Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books
Center for Chinese Research Materials
Copyright
Federal Relations
Foreign Acquisitions Area Committees
Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm
Interlibrary Loan
National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee
Negro Academic Libraries
Nominations
Preservation of Research Library Materials

TASK FORCES

ARL Brochure
Closing the Catalog
University Library Standards (ARL/ACRL)

*Appointment of members to these groups to be made by the President in 1974.

APPENDIX S

MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

JANUARY 1974

University of Alabama Libraries
University, Alabama 35486
James F. Wyatt, Dean of Libraries
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Bruce Peel, Director
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 884-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald W. Koepp, Librarian
(602) 965-3606

Boston Public Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University Libraries
Provo, Utah 84601
Donald K. Nelson, Director
(801) 374-1211 ext. 2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver 8, British Columbia, Canada
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
David A. Jonah, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Richard Dougherty, Librarian
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library
Davis, California 95616
J. R. Blanchard, Librarian
(916) 752-2110 ext. 2167

University of California Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Page Ackerman, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California Library, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92037
Melvin J. Voigt, Librarian
(714) 453-2000

University of California Library
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Donald Davidson, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon R. Williams, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Stanley McElderry, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Harold Schell, Dean, Library Admin. &
Director of Libraries (513) 475-2533

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80304
Ellsworth C. Mason, Director
(303) 443-2211 ext. 7511

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Warren J. Haas, Vice President &
Librarian (212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
G. F. Shepherd, Jr., Acting Director
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Edward C. Lathem, Librarian
(603) 646-2236

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian
(919) 684-8111 ext. 2034

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles Miller, Librarian
(904) 599-3290

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D. C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
Warren N. Boes, Director
(404) 542-2716

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Douglas W. Bryant, Director
(617) 495-2404

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D. C. 20001
Kenneth S. Wilson, Acting Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61803
Lucien W. White, Librarian
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
W. Carl Jackson, Dean of Libraries
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Library
Administration (319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50010
Warren Kuhn, Dean of Library Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
John H. Berthel, Librarian
(301) 366-3300 ext. 437

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
David W. Heron, Director
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian
(202) 426-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Acting Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry Jr., Acting Director
(504) 388-3969

McGill University Library
Montreal 112, Quebec, Canada
Richard A. Farley, Director
(514) 392-4949

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
Howard Rovelstad, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libraries
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Natalie N. Nicholson, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Frederick H. Wagman, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard E. Chapin, Librarian
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Ralph H. Hopp, Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
Dwight Tuckwood, Director
(314) 882-2739

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Joseph F. Caponio, Acting Director
(301) 344-3779

National Library of Canada
Ottawa 4, Ontario, Canada
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 992-0401

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Adam C. Breckenridge, Acting Director
(402) 472-7211

New York Public Library
New York, New York 10018
Richard W. Couper, President
(212) 695-3231

New York State Library
Albany, New York 12224
John A. Humphry, Asst. Commissioner
for Libraries (518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Eugene Kennedy, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-2140

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 933-1301

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
David E. Sparks, Director
(219) 283-7317

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Hugh Atkinson, Director
(614) 422-6152

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
James K. Zink, Director
(405) 325-2611

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075
Roscoe Rouse, Librarian
(405) 372-6211 ext. 237

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
H. William Axford, University Librarian
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 594-7091

Pennsylvania State University Libraries
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of University
Libraries (814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
William S. Dix, Librarian
(609) 452-3190

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 494-8663

Rice University Library
Houston, Texas 77001
Richard L. O'Keeffe, Librarian
(713) 528-4141

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Ben Bowman, Director
(716) 275-4461

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Virginia P. Whitney, Librarian
(201) 932-7505

St. Louis University Library
St. Louis, Missouri 63108
William P. Cole, Director
(314) 535-3300

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Washington, D. C. 20560
Russell Shank, Director
(202) 381-5496

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 746-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Ralph E. McCoy, Dean of Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 321-2300 ext. 2016

State University of New York-Buffalo
Libraries Buffalo, New York 14214
Eldred Smith, Director
(716) 831-4205

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Metod M. Milac, Acting Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Arthur Hamlin, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Richard W. Boss, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(512) 471-3561

Texas A & M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
John B. Smith, Director
(713) 845-6111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada
Robert H. Blackburn, Chief Librarian
(416) 928-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
John H. Gribbin, Director
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger Hanson, Director
(801) 581-6741

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901
Ray Frantz Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Marion A. Milczewski, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
G. Donald Smith, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
William Kurth, Librarian
(314) 863-0100 ext. 4523

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually. Subscription rates for U.S.A. and possessions are $10.00 a year; $5.00 an issue (foreign: $11.20 a year; $6.20 an issue). Checks should be made payable to the Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Association of Research Libraries.
Minutes of the meeting. 1st–
Dec. 1932–
[Princeton, N. J., etc.]
v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th–10th, 12th called respectively: 10th–11th, 13th.
INDEXES:
Subject index.

1st–42d, Dec. 1932–Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59–30046

Library of Congress [8]

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.